NOTE

This Microfiche meets the quality requirements of the American National Standard for Microfiche of Documents (ANSI PH5.9-1975). However, because of imperfections in the document from which it was made, it contains images that are illegible or difficult to read. The source document for this microfiche is the best copy that could be obtained prior to filming.

CIS

Congressional Information Service, Inc.
Washington, D.C.

APPENDIX III

ROLLCALL VOTES REFERRED TO IN DEMOCRATIC ALTERNATIVES, PART III

March 1984

Robert G. Liberatore, Staff Director
(202) 224-5551

S940-2

SENATE VOTING RECORD

NO. 365

97th Congress
2nd Session

September 29, 1982, 10:25 a.m.
Temp. Cong. Rec. p. S-12468

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, 1983

BILL NO.: H.J. Res. 599

AMENDMENT NO.: UP 1309

SUBJECT: **Bumpers-Humphrey amendment prohibiting use of funds for the Clinch River Breeder Reactor Project instead of continuing funding at the current rate of $227 million.**

NOTE: Proponents contended that this project's technology would be 16 years out of date when completed in 1990. The U.S. no longer needs the plutonium produced by breeder technology because: (1) the price of enriched uranium has fallen by over 50 percent; (2) new discoveries in Canada and Australia make it likely we will have enough uranium through the year 2025; and (3) the annual increase in demand for electricity has fallen from 7 to 2 percent. The GAO has concluded that the final cost of the project will rise from the original level of $500 million to $8.8 billion, a cost greatly exceeding any benefit derived from the project's completion. The private utilities, which had originally agreed to underwrite half of the project's cost, have refused to invest more than $257 million, a true indicator of the commercial viability of this technology. Furthermore, all other governments investigating breeder technology have given it a lower priority in recent years. Other technologies, such as increased hydro production, could expand our energy supplies more economically, without the hazard of creating enough plutonium to make 1 million nuclear bombs the size of those dropped on Japan.

Opponents argued that this amendment should be offered to the energy appropriations bill, not an urgent funding bill for the entire government. The U.S. must demonstrate the commercial viability of this technology, they asserted, well in advance of a time the U.S. might need it. This is not a Tennessee pork barrel project because the site was selected for its proximity to a major power grid and the high technology necessary to build the system. Moreover, while the project will be assembled in Tennessee, the system's components will be built across the nation. The U.S. should not relinquish to other industrial nations its lead in a technology which could put a ceiling on the price of electricity at less than half the cost of generating electricity from oil. The project's inflated price is comparable to other construction costs which skyrocketed due to the inflationary spiral that plagued our economy during the 1970's. Half of the approximately $2.6 billion necessary to complete the project will be recovered by the $8 billion worth of electricity which the project will generate during its lifetime.

H.J. Res. 599: Vote Nos. 365-373.

RESULT: AMENDMENT REJECTED

YEAS (48)

Democrats (30 or 70%)

Bentsen
Biden
Bradley
Bumpers
Byrd, Harry F., Jr.
Byrd, Robert C.
Chiles
Cranston
DeConcini
Dixon
Dodd
Eagleton
Exon
Glenn
Hart
Hollings
Leahy
Levin
Melcher
Metzenbaum
Mitchell
Moynihan
Nunn
Pell
Proxmire
Pryor
Randolph
Riegle
Sarbanes
Tsongas

Republicans (18 or 33%)

Armstrong
Boschwitz
Chafee
Cohen
Durenberger
Goldwater
Hatfield
Hawkins
Humphrey
Jepsen
Kassebaum
Lugar
Nickles
Percy
Quayle
Roth
Rudman
Stafford

NAYS (49)

Democrats (13 or 30%)

Boren
Burdick
Cannon
Ford
Heflin
Huddleston
Inouye
Jackson
Johnston
Long
Sasser
Stennis
Zorinsky

Republicans (36 or 67%)

Abdnor
Andrews
Baker
Brady
Cochran
D'Amato
Danforth
Denton
Dole
Domenici
East
Garn
Gorton
Grassley
Hatch
Hayakawa
Heinz
Helms
Kasten
Laxalt
Mathias
Mattingly
McClure
Murkowski
Packwood
Pressler
Schmitt
Simpson
Specter
Stevens
Symms
Thurmond
Tower
Wallop
Warner
Weicker

NOT VOTING (3)

Democrats (3)

Baucus—2AY
Kennedy—2AY
Matsunaga—2

Republicans (0)

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

1—Official Business
2—Necessarily Absent
3—Illness
4—Other

SYMBOLS:

AY—Announced Yea
AN—Announced Nay
PY—Paired Yea
PN—Paired Nay

ANALYSIS OF ISSUE VOTED ON:

Party Cohesion	**Measure of Party Support on Issue as Voted on**	
	For (48)	*Against* (49)
Democrats— 70%	Democrats— 30 or 63%	Democrats— 13 or 27%
Republicans— 67%	Republicans— 18 or 37%	Republicans— 36 or 73%

Prepared and Compiled by Senate Democratic Policy Committee
Robert C. Byrd, Chairman

SENATE VOTING RECORD

NO. 366

97th Congress
2nd Session

September 29, 1982, 1:54 p.m.
Temp. Cong. Rec. p. S-12490

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, 1983

BILL NO.: H.J. Res. 599

AMENDMENT NO.: UP 1310

SUBJECT: Metzenbaum, et al, amendment which suspends, until the national unemployment rate falls to or below 8.7 percent, the two changes made in the 1981 Reconciliation Act for determining State eligibility for the extended unemployment benefits program and sets the expiration of the supplemental benefits program adopted as part of the tax bill also when the national unemployment rate drops to or below 8.7 percent. The affected States include: Alaska, Alabama, Arkansas, Arizona, California, Delaware, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, New Mexico, New Jersey, North Carolina, Ohio, Oregon, Vermont, Tennessee, Utah, and Wisconsin—all States with chronic unemployment problems. (See also Vote No. 367.)

NOTE: Proponents of the amendment contended that it would correct the problems created by provisions of the Omnibus Reconciliation Act of 1981 (taking effect in October of 1982) that will end 13-week Federal extended unemployment benefits to 30 States despite high rates of unemployment. Currently, there are three types of unemployment benefits: 26-week State benefits, Federal extended benefits which are paid in qualified States, and new temporary supplemental benefits. Under the reconciliation provisions, persons receiving 13-week extended unemployment benefits will not be counted in the insured unemployment rate (IUR) which is used to determine a State's eligibility for the extended employment benefits. Additionally, reconcilation provisions require that State unemployment meet 5 percent instead of 4 percent of the IUR in order to qualify for extended benefits Consequently, all but seven or eight States will lose eligibility for the 13-week extended benefits; new supplemental benefits in most States will not be added to the 13-week benefit to extend meaningfully the coverage for unemployed workers in

(OVER)

H.J. Res. 599: Vote Nos. 365-373.

RESULT: AMENDMENT REJECTED

YEAS (47)

Democrats (40 or 91%)

Baucus
Bentsen
Biden
Boren
Bradley
Bumpers
Burdick
Byrd, Robert C.
Cannon
Cranston
DeConcini
Dixon
Dodd
Eagleton
Exon
Ford
Glenn
Hart
Heflin
Hollings
Huddleston
Inouye
Jackson
Johnston
Leahy
Levin
Matsunaga
Melcher
Mitchell
Moynihan
Nunn
Pell
Proxmire
Pryor
Randolph
Riegle
Sarbanes
Sasser
Stennis
Tsongas

Republicans (7 or 13%)

Chafee
Durenberger
Heinz
Mathias
Specter
Stafford
Weicker

NAYS (51)

Democrats (4 or 9%)

Byrd, Harry F., Jr.
Chiles
Metzenbaum
Zorinsky

Republicans (47 or 87%)

Abdnor
Andrews
Armstrong
Baker
Boschwitz
Brady
Cochran
Cohen
D'Amato
Danforth
Denton
Dole
Domenici
East
Garn
Goldwater
Gorton
Grassley
Hatch
Hatfield
Hawkins
Hayakawa
Helms
Humphrey
Jepsen
Kassebaum
Kasten
Laxalt
Lugar
Mattingly
McClure
Murkowski
Nickles
Packwood
Percy
Pressler
Quayle
Roth
Rudman
Schmitt
Simpson
Stevens
Symms
Thurmond
Tower
Wallop
Warner

NOT VOTING (1)

Democrats (1)

Kennedy—2PY

Republicans (0)

LIVE PAIRS (1)

PRESENT AND GIVING:	RECEIVING:
Long (PN)	Kennedy (PY)

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

1—Official Business
2—Necessarily Absent
3—Illness
4—Other

SYMBOLS:

AY—Announced Yea
AN—Announced Nay
PY—Paired Yea
PN—Paired Nay

ANALYSIS OF ISSUE VOTED ON:

Party Cohesion

Democrats— 91%
Republicans— 87%

Measure of Party Support on Issue as Voted on

	For (47)	*Against* (51)
Democrats	40 or 85%	4 or 8%
Republicans	7 or 15%	47 or 92%

Prepared and Compiled by Senate Democratic Policy Committee
Robert C. Byrd, Chairman

economically distressed States. Thus, the majority of economically distressed States will be eligible to receive fewer weeks of unemployment assistance after October, 1982 at a time when unemployment has reached a 40-year record. When the new supplemental program expires in March of 1983, the number of weeks of benefits will be cut even further for the unemployed in every State—regardless of how severe the unemployment problem remains at that time. This amendment would suspend these changes and extend the new supplemental benefits until unemployment falls to the 8.7 percent target set in the 1983 budget. Congress adopted the reconciliation provisions, proponents noted, at a time when supporters of supply-side economics contended that the economy would expand at a 4.2 percent rate in 1982 and 5 percent in 1983 and unemployment rates would fall to 6.4 percent in fiscal 1983. Supply-side economics, however, has left the economy reeling under 10.1 percent unemployment, a 50-year record pace of bankruptcies, and an actual decline in the gross national product. If the economy performs as projected in the budget, the net cost of the amendment is only $430 million in fiscal 1983 according to the CBO because of savings in increased welfare, food stamps, and other payments.

Opponents of the amendment argued that it would roll back important reforms enacted in the Omnibus Reconciliation Act of 1981 and, as such, constitutes legislation on an appropriations bill. Furthermore, it would be irresponsible to spend the $3.4 billion this amendment could cost in addition to the new $2 billion program Congress approved as part of the Tax Reform Act of 1982.

SENATE VOTING RECORD

NO. 367

97th Congress
2nd Session

September 29, 1982, 2:14 p.m.
Temp. Cong. Rec. p. S-12490

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, 1983

BILL NO.: H.J. Res. 599

AMENDMENT NO.: UP 1310

SUBJECT: Dole motion to table the Baker motion to reconsider Vote No. 366, by which the Senate narrowly rejected the Metzenbaum amendment, which suspends, until the national unemployment rate falls below 8.7 percent, the two changes made in the 1981 Reconciliation Act for determining State eligibility for the extended unemployment benefits program and sets the expiration of the supplemental benefits program adopted as part of the tax bill also when the national unemployment rate drops to or below 8.7 percent.

NOTE: Proponents of the amendment contended that it would correct the problems created by provisions of the Omnibus Reconciliation Act of 1981 (taking effect in October of 1982) that will end 13-week Federal extended unemployment benefits to 30 States despite high rates of unemployment. Currently, there are three types of unemployment benefits: 26-week State benefits, Federal extended benefits which are paid in qualified States, and new temporary supplemental benefits. Under the reconciliation provisions, persons receiving 13-week extended unemployment benefits will not be counted in the insured unemployment rate (IUR) which is used to determine a State's eligibility for the extended employment benefits. Additionally, reconcilation provisions require that State unemployment meet 5 percent instead of 4 percent of the IUR in order to qualify for extended benefits Consequently, all but seven or eight States will lose eligibility for the 13-week extended benefits; new supplemental benefits in most States will not be added to the 13-week benefit to extend meaningfully the coverage for unemployed workers in economically distressed States. Thus, the majority of economically distressed States will be eligible to receive fewer weeks of unemployment assistance after October, 1982 at a time when unemployment has reached a 40-year record. When the new supplemental program expires in March of 1983, the number

(OVER)

H.J. Res. 599: Vote Nos. 365-373.

RESULT: MOTION TO TABLE AGREED TO

YEAS (50)

Democrats (3 or 7%)

Byrd,
Harry F., Jr.
Chiles
Zorinsky

Republicans (47 or 87%)

Abdnor
Andrews
Armstrong
Baker
Boschwitz
Brady
Cochran
Cohen
D'Amato
Danforth
Denton
Dole
Domenici
East
Garn
Goldwater
Gorton
Grassley
Hatch
Hatfield
Hawkins
Hayakawa
Helms
Humphrey
Jepsen
Kassebaum
Kasten
Laxalt
Lugar
Mattingly
McClure
Murkowski
Nickles
Packwood
Percy
Pressler
Quayle
Roth
Rudman
Schmitt
Simpson
Stevens
Symms
Thurmond
Tower
Wallop
Warner

NAYS (48)

Democrats (41 or 93%)

Baucus
Bentsen
Biden
Boren
Bradley
Bumpers
Burdick
Byrd,
Robert C.
Cannon
Cranston
DeConcini
Dixon
Dodd
Eagleton
Exon
Ford
Glenn
Hart
Heflin
Hollings
Huddleston
Inouye
Jackson
Johnston
Leahy
Levin
Matsunaga
Melcher
Metzenbaum
Mitchell
Moynihan
Nunn
Pell
Proxmire
Pryor
Randolph
Riegle
Sarbanes
Sasser
Stennis
Tsongas

Republicans (7 or 13%)

Chafee
Durenberger
Heinz
Mathias
Specter
Stafford
Weicker

NOT VOTING (2)

Democrats (2)

Kennedy—2AN
Long—2

Republicans (0)

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:
1—Official Business
2—Necessarily Absent
3—Illness
4—Other

SYMBOLS:
AY—Announced Yea
AN—Announced Nay
PY—Paired Yea
PN—Paired Nay

ANALYSIS OF ISSUE VOTED ON:

Party Cohesion	Measure of Party Support on Issue as Voted on *For* (50)	*Against* (48)
Democrats— 93%	Democrats— 3 or 6%	Democrats— 41 or 85%
Republicans— 87%	Republicans— 47 or 94%	Republicans— 7 or 15%

Prepared and Compiled by Senate Democratic Policy Committee
Robert C. Byrd, Chairman

of weeks of benefits will be cut even further for the unemployed in every State—regardless of how severe the unemployment problem remains at that time. This amendment would suspend these changes and extend the new supplemental benefits until unemployment falls to the 8.7 percent target set in the 1983 budget. Congress adopted the reconciliation provisions, proponents noted, at a time when supporters of supply-side economics contended that the economy would expand at a 4.2 percent rate in 1982 and 5 percent in 1983 and unemployment rates would fall to 6.4 percent in fiscal 1983. Supply-side economics, however, has left the economy reeling under 10.1 percent unemployment, a 50-year record pace of bankruptcies, and an actual decline in the gross national product. If the economy performs as projected in the budget, the net cost of the amendment is only $430 million in fiscal 1983 according to the CBO because of savings in increased welfare, food stamps, and other payments.

Opponents of the amendment argued that it would roll back important reforms enacted in the Omnibus Reconciliation Act of 1981 and, as such, constitutes legislation on an appropriations bill. Furthermore, it would be irresponsible to spend the $3.4 billion this amendment could cost in addition to the new $2 billion program Congress approved as part of the Tax Reform Act of 1982.

SENATE VOTING RECORD

NO. 368

97th Congress
2nd Session

September 29, 1982, 2:33 p.m.
Temp. Cong. Rec. p. S-12491

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, 1983

BILL NO.: H.J. Res. 599 **AMENDMENT NO.:** UP 1315

SUBJECT: **Hatfield motion to table the Helms amendment requiring the Federal Election Commission to implement regulations prohibiting the use of union dues on behalf of political candidates for other political purposes.**

NOTE: Proponents of the amendment contended that it would merely require the FEC to implement regulations to enforce court decisions that have held that dues paid as a condition of employment may not be used by a labor organization on behalf of political or ideological purposes. The Supreme Court held in the Abood v. Detroit Board of Education case that the use of mandatory dues for political purposes abridges the first amendment rights of dissenting workers. They contrasted business and citizen PAC's, which rely on voluntary contributions, with contributions by workers who risk losing their jobs if they refuse to pay union dues.

No statements were given in opposition to the amendment, although concern was expressed that its approval could delay passage of this urgent funding package. The Federal Election Campaign Act specifically prohibits use of dues for monetary payments to candidates but expressly provides the following exceptions: (1) use of dues for partisan communications to members and their families; (2) voter registration and "get-out-the-vote" drives; and (3) establishment and administration of, and solicitations for, funds for a political action committee. In Abood v. Detroit Board of Education, the Supreme Court did not bar use of compulsory dues for political purposes. It held employees cannot constitutionally be compelled to support political and ideological activities which are unrelated to the labor organization's collective bargaining responsibilities, and to which the employees are opposed. The Court decided that dissent is not to be presumed and must affirmatively be made known to the union by dissenting employees.

H.J. Res. 599: Vote Nos. 365-373.

RESULT: MOTION TO TABLE AGREED TO

YEAS (62)

Democrats (44 or 98%)

Baucus
Bentsen
Biden
Boren
Bradley
Bumpers
Burdick
Byrd,
Robert C.
Cannon
Chiles
Cranston
DeConcini
Dixon
Dodd
Eagleton
Exon
Ford
Glenn
Hart
Heflin
Hollings
Huddleston
Inouye
Jackson
Johnston
Leahy
Levin
Long
Matsunaga
Melcher
Metzenbaum
Mitchell
Moynihan
Nunn
Pell
Proxmire
Pryor
Randolph
Riegle
Sarbanes
Sasser
Stennis
Tsongas
Zorinsky

Republicans (18 or 33%)

Brady
Chafee
D'Amato
Danforth
Durenberger
Gorton
Hatfield
Heinz
Kassebaum
Mathias
Murkowski
Packwood
Percy
Roth
Specter
Stafford
Stevens
Weicker

NAYS (37)

Democrats (1 or 2%)

Byrd,
Harry F., Jr.

Republicans (36 or 67%)

Abdnor
Andrews
Armstrong
Baker
Boschwitz
Cochran
Cohen
Denton
Dole
Domenici
East
Garn
Goldwater
Grassley
Hatch
Hawkins
Hayakawa
Helms
Humphrey
Jepsen
Kasten
Laxalt
Lugar
Mattingly
McClure
Nickles
Pressler
Quayle
Rudman
Schmitt
Simpson
Symms
Thurmond
Tower
Wallop
Warner

NOT VOTING (1)

Democrats (1) **Republicans (0)**

Kennedy—2AY

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

1—Official Business
2—Necessarily Absent
3—Illness
4—Other

SYMBOLS:

AY—Announced Yea
AN—Announced Nay
PY—Paired Yea
PN—Paired Nay

ANALYSIS OF ISSUE VOTED ON:

Party Cohesion	Measure of Party Support on Issue as Voted on *For* (62)	*Against* (37)
Democrats—98%	Democrats—44 or 71%	Democrats—1 or 3%
Republicans—67%	Republicans—18 or 29%	Republicans—36 or 97%

Prepared and Compiled by Senate Democratic Policy Committee
Robert C. Byrd, Chairman

SENATE VOTING RECORD

NO. 370

97th Congress
2nd Session

September 29, 1982, 6:56 p.m.
Temp. Cong. Rec. p. S-12590

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, 1983

BILL NO.: H.J. Res. 599

AMENDMENT NO.: UP 1339

SUBJECT: **Baker motion to table the Hollings amendment prohibiting the appropriation of funds for procurement of the MX missile until the President notifies Congress of the basing mode chosen for the MX and 30 days of session of Congress have expired after receipt by Congress of such notice.**

NOTE: The question of basing the MX has bedeviled Congress and three Presidents, but a realistic solution is no nearer now than ever, proponents contended. Proponents of the amendment pointed out that the procurement authorization provided $158 million for basing and $830 million to procure five missiles but conferees precluded obligation of the basing funds until the President submits his choice of a basing mode to Congress for its approval—Vote 331. This amendment would similarly restrict missile production without cutting funds for R&D. Logically, there is no justification for buying missiles before a basing mode and location are chosen and before it is known that the missiles and mode are compatible. Procedurally, it is important to halt progress toward production of the first set of missiles to prevent DOD from claiming that we are committed to the $50 billion program on the basis of obligating the $830 million. The Congress must avoid a situation where stopping the MX costs more than continuing it. In addition, it is not necessary to make major decisions on the MX in an appropriation bill meant only to maintain government operations. The decision should be deferred at least until the November special session when the Senate can give the issue the attention it deserves. The Senate has taken care to link the MX to a basing mode decision, and moreover, the 1981 Cohen-Nunn amendment put the Senate on record in opposition to any non-survivable mode. According to the Air Force, delaying procurement funding until Congress is satisfied, will alter the Initial Operational Capability by no more than a year. The President is due to submit his choice to Congress by December 1. "Dense

(OVER)

H.J. Res. 599: Vote Nos. 365-373.

RESULT: MOTION TO TABLE AGREED TO

YEAS (50)

Democrats (10 or 23%)

Bentsen
Byrd,
Robert C.
Cannon
DeConcini
Heflin
Jackson
Long
Sasser
Stennis
Zorinsky

Republicans (40 or 77%)

Abdnor
Armstrong
Baker
Boschwitz
Brady
Cochran
Cohen
D'Amato
Dole
Domenici
East
Garn
Goldwater
Gorton
Grassley
Hatch
Hawkins
Hayakawa
Helms
Humphrey
Jepsen
Kasten
Laxalt
Lugar
Mattingly
McClure
Murkowski
Nickles
Packwood
Pressler
Roth
Rudman
Schmitt
Simpson
Stevens
Symms
Thurmond
Tower
Wallop
Warner

NAYS (46)

Democrats (34 or 77%)

Baucus
Biden
Boren
Bradley
Bumpers
Burdick
Byrd,
Harry F., Jr.
Chiles
Cranston
Dixon
Dodd
Eagleton
Exon
Ford
Glenn
Hart
Hollings
Huddleston
Inouye
Johnston
Leahy
Levin
Matsunaga
Melcher
Metzenbaum
Mitchell
Moynihan
Nunn
Pell
Proxmire
Pryor
Randolph
Sarbanes
Tsongas

Republicans (12 or 23%)

Andrews
Chafee
Danforth
Durenberger
Hatfield
Heinz
Kassebaum
Mathias
Quayle
Specter
Stafford
Weicker

NOT VOTING (4)

Democrats (2)

Kennedy—2AN
Riegle—2

Republicans (2)

Denton—2
Percy—2AY

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

1—Official Business
2—Necessarily Absent
3—Illness
4—Other

SYMBOLS:

AY—Announced Yea
AN—Announced Nay
PY—Paired Yea
PN—Paired Nay

ANALYSIS OF ISSUE VOTED ON:

Party Cohesion	**Measure of Party Support on Issue as Voted on**	
	For (50)	*Against* (46)
Democrats— 77%	Democrats— 10 or 20%	Democrats— 34 or 74%
Republicans— 77%	Republicans— 40 or 80%	Republicans— 12 or 26%

Prepared and Compiled by Senate Democratic Policy Committee
Robert C. Byrd, Chairman

pack," the mode most often mentioned, is thought to be vulnerable, theoretically suspect, and unlikely to clear Congress. Proponents also questioned whether a survivable basing mode can be found which does not break previous arms control agreements.

Opponents of the amendment contended that the psychological impact of this amendment could be enormous. They quoted the testimony of arms negotiator Ambassador Rowney, before the Armed Services Committee, that the U.S. must be willing to demonstrate its will and determination or the Soviets would be dilatory during arms talks, concluding that Congress will disarm the U.S. for them. The MX is the one positive item the U.S. negotiators have and Congress must not destroy it. Although we have no basing mode now, there probably will be one by the time the missiles are built. Congress, they maintained, is jumping the gun. President Reagan was to announce a basing mode decision in the summer of 1983, but Congress was unwilling to wait; now some Senators will not even wait until December 1. Starting and stopping, caused by Congress, means higher project price tags. It is possible that the President will announce he favors "dense pack." It has undergone substantial development in the last two months and appears to be a survivable, viable system. Senators should not judge it until they have been thoroughly briefed.

SENATE VOTING RECORD

NO. 371

97th Congress
2nd Session

September 29, 1982, 8:10 p.m.
Temp. Cong. Rec. p. S-12603

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, 1983

BILL NO.: H.J. Res. 599

AMENDMENT NO.: UP 1343

SUBJECT: **Hatfield motion to table the Nickles perfecting amendment (to the Kennedy amendment—Vote No. 372) codifying three Administration regulations, presently enjoined by the U.S. District Court, raising the threshhold from $2,000 to $100,000 for contracts exempt from the Davis-Bacon prevailing wage provisions.** (See also Vote No. 357, 97th-1st.)

NOTE: Proponents of the amendment contended that, unlike previous attempts to repeal Davis-Bacon, this amendment would merely codify administrative reforms attempted by the Reagan Administration. Specifically, the amendment would: (1) increase the threshhold that governs the application of Davis-Bacon from contracts of $2,000 to $100,000 in order to exempt small firms from regulation; (2) add the term "helpers" to the term "laborers and mechanics" throughout the act in order to avoid paying a journeyman rate to an unskilled worker; (3) change from the top 30 percent to 50 percent of the wages used to define the prevailing wage in a locale; and (4) distinguish between construction performed in urban and rural areas in order to avoid the effective "importation" of higher wage rates from urban to rural areas. Over a five-year period, this amendment would save approximately $3.5 billion or enough to pay for the Kennedy jobs amendment—Vote No. 372.

Opponents of the amendment asserted that these so-called modifications would effectively repeal Davis-Bacon and violate the will of Congress. These proposals are so suspect that the U.S. District Court in Washington issued a temporary injunction, pending a final ruling, which prevents the Department of Labor from implementing them. There is absolutely no credible evidence that Davis-Bacon is inflationary or that its wage rates are set too high. The Act, proponents noted, is designed to prevent fly-by-night contractors from using wage competition to win contracts which they never would be able to complete because of an inability to hire and retain the skilled workers necessary to the efficient and timely completion of construction projects. Congress should not vote to cut construction wages at a time when ten million Americans are unemployed and the construction industry is experiencing an unemployment rate of 20 percent.

H.J. Res. 599: Vote Nos. 365-373.

RESULT: MOTION TO TABLE AGREED TO

YEAS (52)

Democrats (37 or 84%)

Baucus
Biden
Bradley
Bumpers
Burdick
Byrd,
 Robert C.
Cannon
Chiles
Cranston
DeConcini
Dixon
Dodd
Eagleton
Ford
Glenn
Hart
Heflin
Hollings
Huddleston
Inouye
Jackson
Johnston
Kennedy
Leahy
Levin
Long
Matsunaga
Melcher
Metzenbaum
Mitchell
Moynihan
Pell
Proxmire
Randolph
Sarbanes
Sasser
Tsongas

Republicans (15 or 29%)

Andrews
Chafee
D'Amato
Danforth
Durenberger
Hatfield
Heinz
Mathias
McClure
Murkowski
Packwood
Specter
Stafford
Stevens
Weicker

NAYS (44)

Democrats (7 or 16%)

Bentsen
Boren
Byrd.
 Harry F., Jr.
Nunn
Pryor
Stennis
Zorinsky

Republicans (37 or 71%)

Abdnor
Armstrong
Baker
Boschwitz
Brady
Cochran
Cohen
Dole
Domenici
East
Garn
Goldwater
Gorton
Grassley
Hatch
Hawkins
Hayakawa
Helms
Humphrey
Jepsen
Kassebaum
Kasten
Laxalt
Lugar
Mattingly
Nickles
Pressler
Quayle
Roth
Rudman
Schmitt
Simpson
Symms
Thurmond
Tower
Wallop
Warner

NOT VOTING (3)

Democrats (1)

Riegle—^{2PY}

Republicans (2)

Denton—^{2AN}
Percy—^{2}

LIVE PAIRS (1)

PRESENT AND GIVING:	RECEIVING:
Exon (PN)	Riegle (PY)

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

1—Official Business
2—Necessarily Absent
3—Illness
4—Other

SYMBOLS:

AY—Announced Yea
AN—Announced Nay
PY—Paired Yea
PN—Paired Nay

ANALYSIS OF ISSUE VOTED ON:

Party Cohesion

Democrats—84%
Republicans—71%

Measure of Party Support on Issue as Voted on

For (52)
Democrats—37 or 71%
Republicans—15 or 29%

Against (44)
Democrats—7 or 16%
Republicans—37 or 84%

Prepared and Compiled by Senate Democratic Policy Committee
Robert C. Byrd, Chairman

SENATE VOTING RECORD

NO. 372

97th Congress
2nd Session

September 29, 1982, 8:30 p.m.
Temp. Cong. Rec. p. S-12603

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, 1983

BILL NO.: H.J. Res. 599

AMENDMENT NO.: UP 1342

SUBJECT: **Goldwater motion to table the Kennedy, et al, amendment appropriating approximately $1 billion to employ temporarily, for a maximum of 6 months, unemployed workers to repair the Nation's deteriorating public buildings, roads, and bridges, with 15 percent of the funding to be allocated for the Youth Employment and Training Programs of the Department of Labor.**

NOTE: Proponents asserted that this amendment would address directly the number one economic problem, unemployment, by putting 200,000 unemployed Americans to work on another important problem—rebuilding the decaying infrastructure of our Nation. Only 40 percent of the ten million Americans now unemployed are covered by unemployment insurance, and the Federal government should address this problem. Unlike CETA, this proposal would: (1) provide jobs of only six months in duration, (2) limit to 35 percent total funding for administration and supplies, (3) limit an individual's pay to no more than $5,000, (4) prohibit substitution of current workers with those hired under this temporary measure, (5) bar use of funds for general public service in order to assure that funds are spent on rebuilding the infrastructure, and (6) focus on the long-term unemployed in areas of high unemployment. This proposal would transform the unemployed from tax users into taxpayers and supplement the jobs training bill now in conference.

Opponents contended that this amendment represents a return to troubled CETA "make-work" jobs which this Congress has rejected. Like its predecessor, the proposed program would result in too many funds being consumed in administrative costs and materials instead of putting people to work. Consequently, the amendment would create far fewer than the promised 200,000 jobs. Furthermore, just as in CETA, many of the jobs created under this amendment would be used simply to replace those already employed. Additional government spending, opponents argued, would only increase the deficit, raise interest rates, and lower the chances for a meaningful economic recovery and real jobs.

H.J. Res. 599: Vote Nos. 365-373.

RESULT: **MOTION TO TABLE AGREED TO**

YEAS (60)

Democrats (13 or 29%)

Bentsen
Boren
Byrd,
Harry F., Jr.
Chiles
DeConcini
Exon
Hollings
Johnston
Long
Nunn
Pryor
Stennis
Zorinsky

Republicans (47 or 90%)

Abdnor
Andrews
Armstrong
Baker
Boschwitz
Brady
Cochran
Cohen
D'Amato
Danforth
Dole
Domenici
East
Garn
Goldwater
Gorton
Grassley
Hatch
Hatfield
Hawkins
Hayakawa
Helms
Humphrey
Jepsen
Kassebaum
Kasten
Laxalt
Lugar
Mathias
Mattingly
McClure
Murkowski
Nickles
Packwood
Pressler
Quayle
Roth
Rudman
Schmitt
Simpson
Stafford
Stevens
Symms
Thurmond
Tower
Wallop
Warner

NAYS (37)

Democrats (32 or 71%)

Baucus
Biden
Bradley
Bumpers
Burdick
Byrd,
Robert C.
Cannon
Cranston
Dixon
Dodd
Eagleton
Ford
Glenn
Hart
Heflin
Huddleston
Inouye
Jackson
Kennedy
Leahy
Levin
Matsunaga
Melcher
Metzenbaum
Mitchell
Moynihan
Pell
Proxmire
Randolph
Sarbanes
Sasser
Tsongas

Republicans (5 or 10%)

Chafee
Durenberger
Heinz
Specter
Weicker

NOT VOTING (3)

Democrats (1)

Riegle—2AN

Republicans (2)

Denton—2
Percy—2

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

1—Official Business
2—Necessarily Absent
3—Illness
4—Other

SYMBOLS:

AY—Announced Yea
AN—Announced Nay
PY—Paired Yea
PN—Paired Nay

ANALYSIS OF ISSUE VOTED ON:

Party Cohesion

Democrats— 71%
Republicans— 90%

Measure of Party Support on Issue as Voted on

For (60)
Democrats— 13 or 22%
Republicans— 47 or 78%

Against (37)
Democrats— 32 or 86%
Republicans— 5 or 14%

Prepared and Compiled by Senate Democratic Policy Committee
Robert C. Byrd, Chairman

SENATE VOTING RECORD

NO. 404

97th Congress
2nd Session

December 14. 1982, 2:00 p.m.
Temp. Cong. Rec. p. S-14558

INTERIOR APPROPRIATIONS, 1983

BILL NO.: H.R. 7356

AMENDMENT NO.: UP 1436

SUBJECT: **Bumpers amendment deleting $2.13 million from the Bureau of Land Management's coal leasing program in order to delay the two major coal sales for fiscal 1983 and 1984 to permit Congress to review changes in the coal leasing program.**

NOTE: Proponents contended that the amendment, which is similar to House-passed provisions, would prevent the Interior Department from leasing coal while Congress investigates allegations that the Department leased 1.6 billion tons of coal in April of 1982 at less than the fair market value as required by the 1976 coal leasing amendments. The Interior Department sold these leases at far below any previous definition of fair market value, they claimed, by cutting the minimum acceptable bid from $94.7 million to $52.5 million, only days before the auction. It makes little sense to offer more coal for lease, proponents argued, when more than a 25-year supply of Federal coal is already under lease, when only eight percent of those leases are being mined, and when at least 150,000 miners are unemployed because of depressed coal market conditions. Furthermore, the Department realized an average bonus price of only $0.03 per ton—a precipitous fall from the average of $0.15 per ton two years ago. Only three of the 13 coal leases offered received more than one bid, and two received no bid. To continue this practice only ensures that coal companies will build up their reserves at bargain prices at the taxpayer's expense.

Opponents argued that a bonus price on coal adds to the cost that a consumer must eventually pay for coal. Therefore, it is in the national interest to ensure that coal is brought to the market at the lowest possible cost. In fact, if this amendment is adopted in an attempt to "save" $2.13 million, the Federal Government would actually lose $12 million that would have otherwise been bid on coal in 1983. The bonus price paid, they noted, represents a small fraction of the recovery of the coal's value when compared to royalty payments which the Treasury realizes when coal is actually mined.

H.R. 7356: Vote Nos. 404, 408.

RESULT: AMENDMENT REJECTED

YEAS (47)

Democrats (41 or 95%)

Baucus
Bentsen
Biden
Boren
Bradley
Bumpers
Byrd, Harry F., Jr.
Byrd, Robert C.
Cannon
Chiles
Cranston
Dixon
Dodd
Eagleton
Exon
Ford
Glenn
Heflin
Hollings
Huddleston
Inouye
Jackson
Johnston
Kennedy
Leahy
Levin
Long
Matsunaga
Melcher
Metzenbaum
Mitchell
Nunn
Pell
Proxmire
Pryor
Randolph
Riegle
Sarbanes
Sasser
Tsongas
Zorinsky

Republicans (6 or 12%)

Chafee
Cohen
Humphrey
Packwood
Percy
Specter

NAYS (48)

Democrats (2 or 5%)

Burdick
Stennis

Republicans (46 or 88%)

Abdnor
Andrews
Armstrong
Baker
Boschwitz
Brady
Cochran
D'Amato
Danforth
Denton
Dole
Domenici
Durenberger
East
Garn
Gorton
Grassley
Hatch
Hatfield
Hawkins
Hayakawa
Heinz
Helms
Jepsen
Kassebaum
Kasten
Laxalt
Lugar
Mattingly
McClure
Murkowski
Nickles
Pressler
Quayle
Roth
Rudman
Schmitt
Simpson
Stafford
Stevens
Symms
Thurmond
Tower
Wallop
Warner
Weicker

NOT VOTING (5)

Democrats (3)

DeConcini—3
Hart—2
Moynihan—3

Republicans (2)

Goldwater—2
Mathias—2

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

1—Official Business
2—Necessarily Absent
3—Illness
4—Other

SYMBOLS:

AY—Announced Yea
AN—Announced Nay
PY—Paired Yea
PN—Paired Nay

ANALYSIS OF ISSUE VOTED ON:

Party Cohesion

Democrats—95%
Republicans—88%

Measure of Party Support on Issue as Voted on

For (47)
Democrats—41 or 87%
Republicans—6 or 13%

Against (48)
Democrats—2 or 4%
Republicans—46 or 96%

Prepared and Compiled by Senate Democratic Policy Committee
Robert C. Byrd. Chairman

SENATE VOTING RECORD

NO. 406

97th Congress
2nd Session

December 14, 1982, 8:00 p.m.
Temp. Cong. Rec. p. S-14684

GAS TAX—HIGHWAYS—JOBS

BILL NO.: H.R. 6211 **AMENDMENT NO.:** UP 1441

TITLE: "Surface Transportation Assistance Act of 1982."

SUBJECT: **Robert C. Byrd, et al, amendment (as a substitute for title I of the Baker substitute for the bill) which strikes the 5 cent per gallon gas tax increase and partially delays the third year tax cut for persons with incomes between $50,000 and $65,000 and fully delays it for three years for persons with incomes over $65,000, thereby raising approximately $24 billion; adds a one-year $5.3 billion emergency jobs creation program including: (1) a $2 billion labor-intensive community public works program that would channel funds through the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG); (2) extended Federal supplemental unemployment benefits ranging from two to five weeks depending on jobless rates, at a cost of $700 million; (3) increased funds for several existing programs—public housing improvement ($400 million), displaced worker retraining ($200 million), senior citizen employment ($100 million), abandoned mine reclamation ($37 million), reforestation ($100 million), and agriculture export credits ($750 million); and (4) $1 billion for water and sewer rehabilitation and construction; and preserves creation of a mass transit trust fund and the five-year extension of the Highway Trust Fund.**

This jobs package was endorsed by the Democratic caucus at its December 7 meeting. The estimated $24 billion savings would pay for the highway and bridge repair program in the bill and for the additional public works projects in the amendment, without requiring a tax increase. While President Reagan has repeatedly stated that he will accept no adjustment in the tax cut, Democrats have made several efforts to make tax cuts fairer to those with less income who have not already benefited greatly from the 3 year tax cut. See Vote Nos. 132, 133, 234, and 245.

(OVER)

H.R. 6211: Vote Nos. 400-403, 406, 407, 409, 410, 412-421, 456-458, 460-469.

RESULT: **AMENDMENT REJECTED**

YEAS (44)

Democrats (43 or 96%)

Baucus
Bentsen
Biden
Boren
Bradley
Bumpers
Burdick
Byrd,
Robert C.
Cannon
Chiles
Cranston
Dixon
Dodd
Eagleton
Exon
Ford
Glenn
Hart
Heflin
Hollings
Huddleston

Inouye
Jackson
Johnston
Kennedy
Leahy
Levin
Long
Matsunaga
Melcher
Metzenbaum
Mitchell
Moynihan
Pell
Proxmire
Pryor
Randolph
Riegle
Sarbanes
Sasser
Stennis
Tsongas
Zorinsky

Republicans (1 or 2%)

Packwood

NAYS (53)

Democrats (2 or 4%)

Byrd,
Harry F., Jr.
Nunn

Republicans (51 or 98%)

Abdnor
Andrews
Armstrong
Baker
Boschwitz
Brady
Chafee
Cochran
Cohen
D'Amato
Danforth
Denton
Dole
Domenici
Durenberger
East
Garn
Gorton
Grassley
Hatch
Hatfield
Hawkins
Hayakawa
Heinz
Helms
Humphrey

Jepsen
Kassebaum
Kasten
Laxalt
Lugar
Mattingly
McClure
Murkowski
Nickles
Percy
Pressler
Quayle
Roth
Rudman
Schmitt
Simpson
Specter
Stafford
Stevens
Symms
Thurmond
Tower
Wallop
Warner
Weicker

NOT VOTING (3)

Democrats (1)

DeConcini—3

Republicans (2)

Goldwater—2
Mathias—2

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

1—Official Business
2—Necessarily Absent
3—Illness
4—Other

SYMBOLS:

AY—Announced Yea
AN—Announced Nay
PY—Paired Yea
PN—Paired Nay

ANALYSIS OF ISSUE VOTED ON:

Party Cohesion	**Measure of Party Support on Issue as Voted on**	
	For (44)	*Against* (53)
Democrats— 96%	Democrats— 43 or 98%	Democrats— 2 or 4%
Republicans— 98%	Republicans— 1 or 2%	Republicans— 51 or 96%

Prepared and Compiled by Senate Democratic Policy Committee
Robert C. Byrd, Chairman

NOTE: Proponents argued that they had taken careful note of the lessons learned from past jobs creation efforts in fashioning an approach that represents the culmination of efforts by Democratic Senators to help put Americans back to work. The centerpiece of this amendment, community public works, has a number of desirable features: (1) it is targeted to those who have been unemployed at least 15 of the last 26 weeks, and have been referred by the U.S. Employment Service; (2) its employment opportunities are constructive, providing for a wide range of needed, labor-intensive improvements in communities across the nation; (3) it makes efficient use of revenues by channelling funds directly to State and local governments through the popular and successful CDBG, for projects that are planned and awaiting funding; (4) it would go into effect within 90 days of enactment and expire at the end of the fiscal year; and (5) it restricts administration and supplies to 25 percent of total costs. Of all the proposals before the Senate, it represents the most direct and valuable response to what everyone agrees is our No. 1 problem—12 million jobless Americans. Unemployment costs all levels of government billions of dollars in benefits and lost revenue, and none of the usual economic engines shows any sign of pulling us out of the recession. While this proposal would not help all those who are without jobs, it is a step in the right direction offering hope and opportunity. It more than doubles the number of jobs offered in H.R. 6211, would encourage industry, stimulate the economy, and raise more than enough money to pay for itself. Proponents argued further that delaying the tax cut for the wealthy is a more fair way to finance these projects than a regressive gas tax which would hit hardest those who bore the brunt of the July tax increase. The Kemp-Roth tax cut failed its purpose, that is, to provide investment capital to spur economic recovery. Its primary beneficiaries have not shown an inclination to invest; therefore, delaying the third stage of the tax cut would not impinge on private sector investment.

Opponents argued that there is no reason to expect this proposal to work any better than its predecessors. It is just the type of hasty, unthinking pork barrel program that has consistently failed to produce the promised results. It would simply set up another "make-work" program like CETA that would become operable after the recession is over, would have only a minor impact on unemployment and an adverse effect on interest rates and the deficit while accomplishing tasks of dubious value. It would also invite a veto of the bill. Using Bureau of National Affairs figures, they maintained that even with maximum non-inflationary growth, 60 to 70 percent of those currently unemployed would be unable to find work because of a permanent decline in certain industries. Yet at the same time, they claimed that $200 million is too much for retraining. Only the private sector can solve the unemployment problem, they further contended. Congress' efforts should be devoted to laying the groundwork for a solid, sustainable recovery. The highway and bridge repair program would have been initiated even if there were no recession; it is not, they insisted, a jobs program.

SENATE VOTING RECORD

NO. 407

97th Congress
2nd Session

December 14, 1982, 9:00 p.m.
Temp. Cong. Rec. p. S-14690

GAS TAX—HIGHWAYS—JOBS

BILL NO.: H.R. 6211

AMENDMENT NO.: UP 1443

TITLE: "Surface Transportation Assistance Act of 1982."

SUBJECT: **Bentsen amendment (to the Bentsen amendment) modifying the third-year tax cut by changing the effective date from July 1 to April 1, 1983, reducing the tax cut from 10 percent to 5 percent and deferring the remaining 5 percent of the tax cut until there is no deficit in the annual Federal Budget, thereby reducing projected deficits for FY 1984-87 by $76 billion.**

NOTE: Proponents characterized this amendment as a "mid-course correction" that would compensate for the Reagan economic program which has failed because it attempted to simultaneously cut taxes, increase defense spending, and pursue tight monetary targets. It has resulted in projected deficits of at least $150 billion anually for the forseeable future which guarantee that borrowing by the Treasury will lock private firms and home buyers out of the credit market even in the midst of a recession. The pending amendment would cut the deficit for fiscal 1984-87 by $76 billion and, thus, ease pressure on the credit market. It would also accelerate a portion of the July 1 tax cut in order to stimulate lagging consumer demand. According to a data resources model, the combination of these two effects would reduce the prime rate by one percent for fiscal 1984 and 1985, increase housing starts by 100,000, generate real GNP growth of 4.3 percent in 1984 and 3.9 percent in 1985, and cut unemployment to eight percent in two years. This amendment would allow Congress to stimulate the economy when it needs it most and reduce out-year deficits which cloud any hope for a sustained economic recovery.

Opponents noted that the President's suggestion to accelerate to January the full ten percent tax cut had been rejected because of concerns about increasing deficits. Advancing a five percent cut might provide some stimulus, they conceded, but not enough to affect the economy meaningfully. This amendment income familes making less than $50,000.

H.R. 6211: Vote Nos. 400-403, 406, 407, 409, 410, 412-421, 456-458, 460-469.

RESULT: AMENDMENT REJECTED

YEAS (40)

Democrats (39 or 89%)

Baucus
Bentsen
Biden
Bradley
Bumpers
Burdick
Byrd,
Harry F., Jr.
Byrd,
Robert C.
Cannon
Chiles
Cranston
Dodd
Eagleton
Exon
Ford
Glenn
Hart
Hollings
Huddleston
Inouye
Jackson
Johnston
Leahy
Levin
Long
Matsunaga
Melcher
Metzenbaum
Mitchell
Nunn
Pell
Proxmire
Pryor
Randolph
Riegle
Sarbanes
Sasser
Stennis
Tsongas

Republicans (1 or 2%)

Packwood

NAYS (54)

Democrats (5 or 11%)

Boren
Dixon
Heflin
Kennedy
Zorinsky

Republicans (49 or 98%)

Abdnor
Andrews
Armstrong
Baker
Boschwitz
Brady
Chafee
Cochran
Cohen
D'Amato
Danforth
Denton
Dole
Domenici
Durenberger
East
Garn
Gorton
Grassley
Hatch
Hatfield
Hawkins
Hayakawa
Heinz
Helms
Humphrey
Jepsen
Kassebaum
Kasten
Laxalt
Lugar
Mattingly
McClure
Murkowski
Nickles
Percy
Pressler
Quayle
Roth
Rudman
Schmitt
Specter
Stafford
Symms
Thurmond
Tower
Wallop
Warner
Weicker

NOT VOTING (6)

Democrats (2)

DeConcini—[3]
Moynihan—[3]

Republicans (4)

Goldwater—[2]
Mathias—[2]
Simpson—[2]
Stevens—[2]

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

1—Official Business
2—Necessarily Absent
3—Illness
4—Other

SYMBOLS:

AY—Announced Yea
AN—Announced Nay
PY—Paired Yea
PN—Paired Nay

ANALYSIS OF ISSUE VOTED ON:

Party Cohesion

Democrats— 89%
Republicans— 98%

Measure of Party Support on Issue as Voted on

For (40)	*Against* (54)
Democrats— 39 or 98%	Democrats— 5 or 9%
Republicans— 1 or 2%	Republicans— 49 or 91%

Prepared and Compiled by Senate Democratic Policy Committee
Robert C. Byrd, Chairman

SENATE VOTING RECORD

NO. 412

97th Congress
2nd Session

December 15. 1982. 5:08 p.m.
Temp. Cong. Rec. p. S-14809

GAS TAX—HIGHWAYS—JOBS

BILL NO.: H.R. 6211

AMENDMENT NO.: 5008

TITLE: "Surface Transportation Assistance Act of 1982."

SUBJECT: **Baker motion to table the Metzenbaum, et al, modified amendment (taking with it the Specter perfecting amendment which extends Federal court jurisdiction to "anti-dumping" cases) providing that only steel, cement, and ferro-alloys manufactured in the U.S. may be used in the construction and repair of highways and bridges under the bill.**

NOTE: Proponents of the amendment maintained that a trade war is already raging and the U.S. is not even firing a shot. Our lucrative markets remain open while some of our trading partners choke off foreign products with quotas, tariffs, currency valuations, credit differentials, excessive testing and safety requirements, and restrictions on investment. Ironically, some of the countries to benefit most from a repair program without a "Buy American" clause are some of the worst offenders. The U.S. trade deficit will be $30 billion this year and is likely to climb to $70 billion next year. Negotiations have not produced tangible results. Trade Representative Brock's ministerial meeting barely averted disaster, and the highly touted government procurement code has not attracted contracts that would not have come our way without it. This amendment could lead to the creation of thousands of jobs for Americans—every half million dollars spent on public works calls for about 193 tons of steel; for every ton of steel, 5,000 direct steel jobs are created. It is illogical, they contended, to levy additional taxes on Americans to create jobs somewhere else, while unemployment stands at 10.8 percent and the steel industry is in a shambles. The purchase of domestic steel, cement, and ferro-alloys would recycle money back into the economy in the form of corporate, individual, sales, excise and gas taxes. Return on the taxpayer's investment would be virtually zero if the goods were bought overseas. We risk losing our vital industries, and even though this Administration may be willing to write them off, they are essential

(OVER)

H.R. 6211: Vote Nos. 400-403, 406, 407, 409, 410, 412-421, 456-458, 460-469.

RESULT: **MOTION TO TABLE AGREED TO**

YEAS (51)

Democrats
(12 or 26%)

Baucus
Bradley
Burdick
Byrd.
Harry F., Jr.
Chiles
Exon
Hart
Jackson
Johnston
Matsunaga
Nunn
Proxmire

Republicans
(39 or 75%)

Abdnor
Andrews
Armstrong
Baker
Brady
Chafee
Cochran
Cohen
Danforth
Dole
Domenici
East
Garn
Gorton
Hatfield
Hawkins
Hayakawa
Helms
Humphrey
Jepsen
Kassebaum
Laxalt
Mattingly
McClure
Murkowski
Nickles
Packwood
Percy
Quayle
Roth
Rudman
Schmitt
Stafford
Stevens
Symms
Thurmond
Tower
Warner
Weicker

NAYS (47)

Democrats
(34 or 74%)

Bentsen
Biden
Boren
Bumpers
Byrd.
Robert C.
Cannon
Cranston
DeConcini
Dixon
Dodd
Eagleton
Ford
Glenn
Heflin
Hollings
Huddleston
Inouye
Kennedy
Leahy
Levin
Long
Melcher
Metzenbaum
Mitchell
Moynihan
Pell
Pryor
Randolph
Riegle
Sarbanes
Sasser
Stennis
Tsongas
Zorinsky

Republicans
(13 or 25%)

Boschwitz
D'Amato
Denton
Durenberger
Grassley
Hatch
Heinz
Kasten
Lugar
Pressler
Simpson
Specter
Wallop

NOT VOTING (2)

Democrats (0)

Republicans (2)

Goldwater—2
Mathias—2

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

1—Official Business
2—Necessarily Absent
3—Illness
4—Other

SYMBOLS:

AY—Announced Yea
AN—Announced Nay
PY—Paired Yea
PN—Paired Nay

ANALYSIS OF ISSUE VOTED ON:

Party Cohesion

Democrats— 74%
Republicans— 75%

Measure of Party Support on Issue as Voted on

For (51)
Democrats— 12 or 24%
Republicans— 39 or 76%

Against (47)
Democrats— 34 or 72%
Republicans— 13 or 28%

Prepared and Compiled by Senate Democratic Policy Committee
Robert C. Byrd, Chairman

for economic and military security. Claims that American steel workers are "living off the fat of the land" confounded proponents, and they countered that workers' pleas for jobs could not begin to compare with other special interest legislation that comes before the Senate. Since the House passed a similar provision, Senate adoption of this amendment would help gain support for H.R. 6211. Specter amendment proponents further argued that an essential ingredient of free trade is fair trade. If this effective enforcement aid against dumping and subsidies were passed, broader legislative measures toward protectionism may well be avoided.

Opponents of the amendment pointed out that just weeks ago in Geneva, Special Trade Representative Brock labored to prevent the world trading system from collapsing into a riot of protectionism by extracting agreements from 87 nations not to impose new trade barriers. A "Buy American" clause is irresponsible, even though it seems patriotic and is not technically a GATT violation. It surely would jeopardize our leadership position in trade negotiations and has the potential to start a trade war. The U.S., along with many other nations, depends heavily on exports, hence, on open markets around the world. It is estimated that 13 percent of U.S. jobs are export-related and that each $1 billion in exports produces about 30,000 jobs. Negotiations produced the government procurement code adopted at the 1978 Tokyo Round and informal import limits on Japanese steel. A protectionist "buy national" provision, on the other hand, would be a step backward. The steel industry has been protected for the last 20 years, they maintained, yet inefficient production and a highly paid, relatively unproductive labor force has priced it out of world markets. The Metzenbaum amendment constitutes special interest legislation of the first order, they argued. Isolating these three industries from competition will raise project costs and result in fewer repairs. False demand will be created, thereby sheltering these industries from the hard truth that the economy is changing. In contrast, the 1978 Transportation Authorization, P.L. 95-599, contained a similar clause interpreted by regulations as requiring 51 percent domestic components by value—not 100 percent as in this measure. They argued further that the Specter amendment is draconian, would overload the judicial system, would subject aggrieved U.S. companies to unnecessary scrutiny by foreign companies, and would cause chaos in the international trading system. Congress devised an administrative solution to dumping and subsidies in 1979, and does not yet have sufficient information to evaluate its operation. Without the benefit of full committee consideration, the Senate should not attempt changes this complex.

SENATE VOTING RECORD

NO. 414

97th Congress
2nd Session

December 15, 1982, 11:36 p.m.
Temp. Cong. Rec. p. S-14878

GAS TAX—HIGHWAYS—JOBS

BILL NO.: H.R. 6211

AMENDMENT NO.: UP 1468

TITLE: "Surface Transportation Assistance Act of 1982."

SUBJECT: **Baker motion to table the Pryor amendment postponing all tax changes and extensions in the bill except for the five-cent per gallon gas tax increase and postponing the weight, length, and width changes in the bill for vehicles using the interstate highway system.** (See also Vote Nos. 384, 392, and 393.)

NOTE: Proponents of the amendment contended that it separates and postpones the excise and use tax portion of the bill to afford affected industries the opportunity to make their case, as the Senate has always allowed affected parties to do. This bill is moving too fast to allow sufficient time to consider the larger issue involved in this legislation—the effect of increased truck taxes on the trucking industry itself, other industries, and ultimately the American consumer. While granting that trucks should pay additional taxes because of their heavy highway use and because of their considerable effect on certain segments of the system, proponents argued that these new taxes verge on a "punishment tax." It would cost the government nothing to delay the truck taxes since they are not scheduled to go into effect until after the Senate has a chance in early 1983 to consider more carefully the effects of such legislation.

Opponents maintained that major changes in truck taxes have been under consideration in the Senate for a number of months, and should be included in the bill at this time to insure their enactment. There is disagreement over what truckers should pay, but it would not be fair to exclude them entirely, requiring other highway users to pay disproportionately for highway and bridge repairs. Heavy trucks currently contribute only 26 percent of the highway trust fund, and although the proposed increases are steep, they are scheduled to be phased in over a three-year period and are far less than those originally recommended.

H.R. 6211: Vote Nos. 400-403, 406, 407, 409, 410, 412-421, 456-458, 460-469.

RESULT: MOTION TO TABLE AGREED TO

YEAS (48)			NAYS (37)			NOT VOTING (15)	
Democrats (11 or 31%)	**Republicans (37 or 76%)**		**Democrats (25 or 69%)**		**Republicans (12 or 24%)**	**Democrats (10)**	**Republicans (5)**
Baucus	Abdnor	Jepsen	Biden	Jackson	Armstrong	Byrd, Harry F., Jr.—2	Goldwater—2
Bentsen	Andrews	Kasten	Bumpers	Levin	Boschwitz	Cranston—2	Hatch—2
Boren	Baker	Laxalt	Byrd, Robert C.	Long	Cohen	DeConcini—2	Packwood—2
Bradley	Brady	Mathias	Cannon	Matsunaga	Denton	Eagleton—2	Roth—2
Burdick	Chafee	McClure	Chiles	Metzenbaum	East	Exon—2	Weicker—2
Hart	Cochran	Murkowski	Dixon	Mitchell	Helms	Glenn—2	
Leahy	D'Amato	Percy	Dodd	Nunn	Kassebaum	Johnston—2	
Melcher	Danforth	Quayle	Ford	Pryor	Lugar	Kennedy—2	
Pell	Dole	Rudman	Heflin	Riegle	Mattingly	Moynihan—3	
Proxmire	Domenici	Schmitt	Hollings	Sarbanes	Nickles	Stennis—2	
Randolph	Durenberger	Simpson	Huddleston	Sasser	Pressler		
	Garn	Stafford	Inouye	Tsongas	Specter		
	Gorton	Stevens		Zorinsky			
	Grassley	Symms					
	Hatfield	Thurmond					
	Hawkins	Tower					
	Hayakawa	Wallop					
	Heinz	Warner					
	Humphrey						

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:
1—Official Business
2—Necessarily Absent
3—Illness
4—Other

ANALYSIS OF ISSUE VOTED ON:

Party Cohesion	**Measure of Party Support on Issue as Voted on**	
	For (48)	*Against* (37)
Democrats—69%	Democrats—11 or 23%	Democrats—25 or 68%
Republicans—76%	Republicans—37 or 77%	Republicans—12 or 32%

Prepared and Compiled by Senate Democratic Policy Committee
Robert C. Byrd, Chairman

SENATE VOTING RECORD

NO. 415

97th Congress
2nd Session

December 16, 1982, 10:31 a.m.
Temp. Cong. Rec. p. S-14946

GAS TAX—HIGHWAYS—JOBS

BILL NO.: H.R. 6211

AMENDMENT NO.: UP 1478

TITLE: "Surface Transportation Assistance Act of 1982."

SUBJECT: **Dole motion to table the Levin, et al, amendment extending Federal unemployment compensation benefits for an additional 2 to 5 weeks, depending on State insured unemployment rates, at a cost of $700 million.** (See Vote No. 416 on cloture on the substitute which if invoked would have precluded an up or down vote on this amendment. See also Vote Nos. 140, 248, 366, 367, 406, and 418-420.)

NOTE: Proponents of the amendment asserted that this was a focused attempt to ease the burden of jobless Americans and their families. Over a million more workers have lost their jobs since enactment last August of the modest Federal supplemental benefits (FSB) program. The Congressional Budget Office has estimated that a million workers have exhausted their benefits since October and over two million more will lose their benefits under the current FSB program. This amendment would add five weeks of benefits to 28 States which qualify for extended benefits and have insured unemployment rates (IUR) over four percent, for a total of 15 weeks of FSB and a maximum of 54 weeks of total benefits. It would add five weeks of benefits to 11 States which have an IUR of between 3.5 to 3.99 percent, for a total of 13 weeks of FSB and a maximum of 39 weeks of total benefits. It would add two weeks for 11 States with an IUR below 3.5 percent for a total of eight weeks of FSB and a maximum of 23 weeks of total benefits.

Opponents of the amendment noted that the $700 to $980 million cost of this amendment would be on top of a $2.2 billion FSB program which provides benefits to an estimated two million workers who would have exhausted their benefits under regular unemployment compensation programs. Under this current program, unemployed workers can receive benefits for a total of 49 weeks in 38 States while jobless workers in the remaining States may receive benefits ranging from 32 to 34 weeks. The current FSB program already embodies the only desirable changes needed in unemployment compensation this year. Furthermore, studies should be made to ensure that FSB benefits are going to those in true financial distress. Adding to the Federal deficit would not help the unemployed, but would prolong the recession which may have deprived them of their jobs in the first place.

H.R. 6211: Vote Nos. 400-403, 406, 407, 409, 410, 412-421, 456-458, 460-469.

RESULT: MOTION TO TABLE DEFEATED

YEAS (47)

Democrats (3 or 7%)

Byrd,
Harry F., Jr.
Exon
Zorinsky

Republicans (44 or 83%)

Abdnor
Andrews
Armstrong
Baker
Boschwitz
Brady
Cochran
Cohen
D'Amato
Danforth
Denton
Dole
Domenici
Durenberger
East
Garn
Gorton
Grassley
Hatch
Hatfield
Hawkins
Hayakawa
Helms
Humphrey
Jepsen
Kassebaum
Kasten
Laxalt
Mattingly
McClure
Murkowski
Nickles
Pressler
Roth
Rudman
Schmitt
Simpson
Stafford
Stevens
Symms
Thurmond
Tower
Wallop
Warner

NAYS (50)

Democrats (41 or 93%)

Baucus
Bentsen
Biden
Boren
Bradley
Bumpers
Burdick
Byrd,
Robert C.
Cannon
Chiles
Cranston
DeConcini
Dixon
Dodd
Eagleton
Ford
Hart
Heflin
Hollings
Huddleston
Inouye
Jackson
Johnston
Kennedy
Leahy
Levin
Long
Melcher
Metzenbaum
Mitchell
Moynihan
Nunn
Pell
Proxmire
Pryor
Randolph
Riegle
Sarbanes
Sasser
Stennis
Tsongas

Republicans (9 or 17%)

Chafee
Heinz
Lugar
Mathias
Packwood
Percy
Quayle
Specter
Weicker

NOT VOTING (3)

Democrats (2)

Glenn—2
Matsunaga—2

Republicans (1)

Goldwater—2

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

1—Official Business
2—Necessarily Absent
3—Illness
4—Other

SYMBOLS:

AY—Announced Yea
AN—Announced Nay
PY—Paired Yea
PN—Paired Nay

ANALYSIS OF ISSUE VOTED ON:

Party Cohesion	Measure of Party Support on Issue as Voted on *For* (47)	*Against* (50)
Democrats— 93%	Democrats— 3 or 6%	Democrats— 41 or 82%
Republicans— 83%	Republicans— 44 or 94%	Republicans— 9 or 18%

Prepared and Compiled by Senate Democratic Policy Committee
Robert C. Byrd, Chairman

SENATE VOTING RECORD

NO. 416

97th Congress
2nd Session

December 16, 1982, 11:18 a.m.
Temp. Cong. Rec. p. S-14947

GAS TAX—HIGHWAYS—JOBS
(CLOTURE)

BILL NO.: H.R. 6211 AMENDMENT NO.: 4998

TITLE: "Surface Transportation Assistance Act of 1982."

SUBJECT: **Baker, et al, motion to close debate on the Baker amendment as a substitute for the bill.** (See also Vote Nos. 415, 417, 456, and 466.)

NOTE: After failing to table the preceding Levin amendment, Republicans tried to make its consideration impossible by invoking cloture. Opponents, however, refused to support efforts to close debate on the bill until after consideration of the urgently needed extension of unemployment benefits. This gamble by the Senate Republican Leadership, which risked passage of the bill in the face of a filibuster by a handful of conservative Republican Senators, provided an accurate measure of Republican determination to avoid extending unemployment benefits. Only after these attempts to prevent passage of any additional weeks of benefits failed did Republicans relent and join with Democrats in the Dole-Domenici-Levin amendment (Vote Nos. 418-420), which was only slightly different from the original Levin amendment agreed to by a caucus of Democratic Senators on December 7, 1982, as part of the "Democratic Jobs Package"—Vote No. 406.

The cloture petition, presented December 14, 1982, was signed by Senators Baker, Boschwitz, Thurmond, Stevens, Rudman, Specter, Dole, Gorton, Chafee, Packwood, Stafford, Hayakawa, Lugar, McClure, Quayle, Murkowski, Durenberger, and Randolph.

H.R. 6211: Vote Nos. 400-403, 406, 407, 409, 410, 412-421, 456-458, 460-469.

RESULT: CLOTURE MOTION REJECTED, 3/5THS NOT HAVING VOTED IN THE AFFIRMATIVE

YEAS (48)			**NAYS (50)**			**NOT VOTING (2)**	
Democrats (7 or 16%)	**Republicans (41 or 77%)**		**Democrats (38 or 84%)**		**Republicans (12 or 23%)**	**Democrats (1)**	**Republicans (1)**
Bentsen	Abdnor	Lugar	Baucus	Jackson	Andrews	Glenn—2	Goldwater—2
Byrd,	Baker	Mathias	Biden	Johnston	Armstrong		
Harry F., Jr.	Brady	Mattingly	Boren	Kennedy	Boschwitz		
Chiles	Chafee	McClure	Bradley	Leahy	Denton		
DeConcini	Cochran	Murkowski	Bumpers	Levin	East		
Pell	Cohen	Packwood	Burdick	Long	Grassley		
Randolph	D'Amato	Percy	Byrd,	Matsunaga	Hatch		
Sasser	Danforth	Pressler	Robert C.	Melcher	Helms		
	Dole	Quayle	Cannon	Metzenbaum	Humphrey		
	Domenici	Roth	Cranston	Mitchell	Nickles		
	Durenberger	Rudman	Dixon	Moynihan	Specter		
	Garn	Schmitt	Dodd	Nunn	Weicker		
	Gorton	Simpson	Eagleton	Proxmire			
	Hatfield	Stafford	Exon	Pryor			
	Hawkins	Stevens	Ford	Riegle			
	Hayakawa	Symms	Hart	Sarbanes			
	Heinz	Thurmond	Heflin	Stennis			
	Jepsen	Tower	Hollings	Tsongas			
	Kassebaum	Wallop	Huddleston	Zorinsky			
	Kasten	Warner	Inouye				
	Laxalt						

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

1—Official Business
2—Necessarily Absent
3—Illness
4—Other

SYMBOLS:

AY—Announced Yea
AN—Announced Nay
PY—Paired Yea
PN—Paired Nay

ANALYSIS OF ISSUE VOTED ON:

Party Cohesion	**Measure of Party Support on Issue as Voted on**	
	For (48)	*Against* (50)
Democrats— 84%	Democrats— 7 or 15%	Democrats— 38 or 76%
Republicans— 77%	Republicans— 41 or 85%	Republicans— 12 or 24%

Prepared and Compiled by Senate Democratic Policy Committee
Robert C. Byrd, Chairman

SENATE VOTING RECORD

NO. 424

97th Congress
2nd Session

December 17, 1982, 2:49 a.m.
Session of December 16, 1982
Temp. Cong. Rec. p. S-15057

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, 1983

BILL NO.: H.J. Res. 631 AMENDMENT NO.: UP 1486

SUBJECT: **Jackson modified amendment (to the Committee amendment) prohibiting the obligation of funds for the basing of the MX missile until both Houses of Congress have passed a concurrent resolution approving the President's basing mode; requiring the President to submit to Congress, no earlier than March 1, 1983, his proposed MX basing mode with a detailed assessment of alternatives (such as Trident II and Minuteman missile modifications, deep underground basing, multiple protective shelters, closely spaced basing, a road mobile missile, and a common land and sea missile); providing expedited procedures for the adoption of the approval resolution; and retaining the Committee amendment's prohibition on production funds until the adoption of an approval resolution.** (See also Vote Nos. 113, 370, and 423.)

NOTE: Proponents pointed out that the amendment, which leaves intact the Hollings language giving Congress the final decision on the MX and its basing mode, would expedite the legislative decision-making process. It would also place additional restrictions on MX basing funds for R&D and assure a timely decision in 1983 thus minimizing the amount of money wasted on basing modes unacceptable to Congress. Expedited procedure rules should be adopted because of the vital need to fortify the land leg of the strategic triad so important to deterring nuclear war. No perfect basing mode is likely to be found, proponents conceded, in view of the Soviet's offensive capabilities. Congress, however, must select an alternative which will complicate any attack on our land-based ICBM's in order to prevent the Soviets from concentrating their efforts on countering U.S. strategic bombers and missile submarines. Unilaterally abandoning modernization of our strategic force will severely lessen our ability to exact arms reductions from the Soviet Union. Any MX decision must be weighed against its effect on

(OVER)

H.J. Res. 631: Vote Nos. 422-455, 459.

RESULT: AMENDMENT AGREED TO

YEAS (56)

Democrats (15 or 33%)

Bentsen
Boren
Byrd,
Harry F., Jr.
Byrd,
Robert C.
Cannon
Chiles
DeConcini
Exon
Heflin
Jackson
Johnston
Long
Nunn
Stennis
Zorinsky

Republicans (41 or 77%)

Abdnor
Armstrong
Baker
Boschwitz
Brady
Cochran
Cohen
D'Amato
Danforth
Denton
Dole
Domenici
East
Garn
Gorton
Grassley
Hatch
Hawkins
Hayakawa
Helms
Humphrey
Jepsen
Kasten
Laxalt
Lugar
Mattingly
McClure
Murkowski
Nickles
Percy
Quayle
Roth
Rudman
Schmitt
Simpson
Stevens
Symms
Thurmond
Tower
Wallop
Warner

NAYS (42)

Democrats (30 or 67%)

Baucus
Biden
Bradley
Bumpers
Burdick
Cranston
Dixon
Dodd
Eagleton
Ford
Hart
Hollings
Huddleston
Inouye
Kennedy
Leahy
Levin
Matsunaga
Melcher
Metzenbaum
Mitchell
Moynihan
Pell
Proxmire
Pryor
Randolph
Riegle
Sarbanes
Sasser
Tsongas

Republicans (12 or 23%)

Andrews
Chafee
Durenberger
Hatfield
Heinz
Kassebaum
Mathias
Packwood
Pressler
Specter
Stafford
Weicker

NOT VOTING (2)

Democrats (1)

Glenn—2

Republicans (1)

Goldwater—2

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

1—Official Business
2—Necessarily Absent
3—Illness
4—Other

SYMBOLS:

AY—Announced Yea
AN—Announced Nay
PY—Paired Yea
PN—Paired Nay

ANALYSIS OF ISSUE VOTED ON:

Party Cohesion	Measure of Party Support on Issue as Voted on	
	For (56)	*Against* (42)
Democrats— 67%	Democrats— 15 or 27%	Democrats— 30 or 71%
Republicans— 77%	Republicans— 41 or 73%	Republicans— 12 or 29%

Prepared and Compiled by Senate Democratic Policy Committee
Robert C. Byrd, Chairman

whether our NATO allies will support our bargaining position in negotiations to reduce intermediate range nuclear weapons in Europe. Some emphasized that Congress must carefully analyze the President's proposed closely spaced basing mode because: (1) it was adopted by the President over the objections of a majority of Joint Chiefs; (2) it apparently would violate the SALT II ban on construction of fixed launchers; (3) it could be compromised by Soviet counter-measures within four years of deployment; and (4) it might require deployment of an AMB system in violation of SALT I limitations. Questions have also been raised by Dr. Charles Townes, head of the President's first blue ribbon panel on MX basing, about the ability of the U.S. to harden its silos sufficiently. The Exon modification, which the sponsors of the Jackson amendment accepted, ensures that a broad spectrum of alternatives to the MX will be evaluated to ensure that a possible rejection of the MX does not result in abandonment of the land-based missile.

Opponents asserted that the Jackson amendment unnecessarily gives up in advance the traditional Senate right of debate—which normally could be accomplished only by a cloture vote of 60 Senators—on a missile system of vital importance. This political maneuver is designed to bolster the chances of a questionable weapon even in the wake of the 1982 election mandate to moderate defense spending. The MX would undermine deterrence because its silo-killing capability implies a first-strike or limited-nuclear war strategy. It is not a credible retaliatory weapon because it cannot be based in a survivable mode. It is unlikely that the Reagan Administration could develop a survivable mode in a few months when 34 basing options have been rejected over the last ten years. The MX is not a bargaining chip that would force the Soviet Union to negotiate since the Administration's arms reduction proposal allows its deployment. Construction of the CSB fixed missile sites would violate the unratified SALT II treaty, which the Administration has promised to respect. Similarly, the MX's vulnerability to Soviet attack would require deployment of an ABM system in violation of the SALT I treaty. Deploying MX in CSB would increase pressure to violate the current ban on nuclear tests in the atmosphere because of the need to ensure that the effects of fratricide would destroy in-coming Soviet warheads. Some argued that alternative land-based missiles must be explored while others asserted that our current weapons, including the Minuteman and Trident missiles, and the B-52 (armed with cruise missiles) and B-1 bombers can provide adequate deterrence. If the U.S. is at the disadvantage which the President claims, proponents asked, why has he ordered the dismantlement of our largest ICBM, the Titan, which can deliver our most powerful warhead and one-third of our total land-based megatonage?

Later the same day, the Senate adopted by unanimous consent a Hart amendment to prohibit any MX flight-testing before a final Congressional decision on MX and its basing mode in order to perserve the option of testing one new ICBM under the unratified SALT II treaty. It was intended to respond to opponents' concerns that flight testing of the MX might complicate verification of arms control agreements should a missile other than the MX be agreed upon.

SENATE VOTING RECORD

NO. 426

97th Congress
2nd Session

December 17, 1982, 4:06 a.m.
Session of December 16
Temp. Cong. Rec. p. S-15064

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, 1983

BILL NO.: H.J. Res. 631

SUBJECT: **Committee amendment restoring funds for the research and development, design, and construction of the Clinch River Breeder Reactor.** (See also Vote Nos. 365, 97th-2d and 354-356, 97th-1st.)

NOTE: *Proponents contended that terminating the Clinch River Breeder Reactor project would be wasteful as well as irresponsible considering that its design is 90 percent complete, 70 percent of its components have been purchased or ordered, the licensing process is continuing, and site preparation has begun. Breeder reactor technology is the only known technology capable of meeting our electrical energy needs for the indefinite future at a cost comparable to that of electrical generators today. European countries continue to invest funds for breeder reactor development, and the international community strongly supports rapid development of breeder technology, citing lower radiation exposure, less thermal pollution, and less nuclear waste for disposal. The Clinch River project would make use of approximately 98 percent of wasted uranium energy potential and could generate $8 billion in revenues. Cost estimates for the project are inflated by the addition of borrowing costs and by artificial delays imposed on the project. The private sector should not be required to invest additional monies in Clinch River, they added, until the Federal government completes the development of breeder reactor technology and the accompanying licensing procedures. While some agreed that future funding, as well as other items, should be reviewed extensively, they argued that it would be more cost-efficient to complete the Clinch River Breeder Reactor.*

(OVER)

H.J. Res. 631: Vote Nos. 422-455, 459.

RESULT: AMENDMENT AGREED TO

YEAS (49)

Democrats (11 or 24%)

Boren
Burdick
Cannon
Heflin
Huddleston
Jackson
Johnston
Long
Sasser
Stennis
Zorinsky

Republicans (38 or 73%)

Abdnor
Andrews
Baker
Brady
Cochran
D'Amato
Danforth
Denton
Dole
Domenici
East
Garn
Gorton
Grassley
Hatch
Hawkins
Hayakawa
Heinz
Helms
Jepsen
Kasten
Laxalt
Mathias
Mattingly
McClure
Murkowski
Pressler
Rudman
Schmitt
Simpson
Specter
Stevens
Symms
Thurmond
Tower
Wallop
Warner
Weicker

NAYS (48)

Democrats (34 or 76%)

Baucus
Bentsen
Biden
Bradley
Bumpers
Byrd,
 Harry F., Jr.
Byrd,
 Robert C.
Chiles
Cranston
DeConcini
Dixon
Dodd
Eagleton
Exon
Ford
Hart
Hollings
Inouye
Kennedy
Leahy
Levin
Matsunaga
Melcher
Metzenbaum
Mitchell
Moynihan
Nunn
Pell
Proxmire
Pryor
Randolph
Riegle
Sarbanes
Tsongas

Republicans (14 or 27%)

Armstrong
Boschwitz
Chafee
Cohen
Durenberger
Humphrey
Kassebaum
Lugar
Nickles
Packwood
Percy
Quayle
Roth
Stafford

NOT VOTING (2)

Democrats (1)	Republicans (1)
Glenn—^{2AN}	Goldwater—^{2PY}

LIVE PAIRS (1)

PRESENT AND GIVING:	RECEIVING:
Hatfield (PN)	Goldwater (PY)

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

1—Official Business
2—Necessarily Absent
3—Illness
4—Other

SYMBOLS:

AY—Announced Yea
AN—Announced Nay
PY—Paired Yea
PN—Paired Nay

ANALYSIS OF ISSUE VOTED ON:

Party Cohesion

Democrats— 76%
Republicans— 73%

Measure of Party Support on Issue as Voted on

For (49)
Democrats— 11 or 22%
Republicans— 38 or 78%

Against (48)
Democrats— 34 or 71%
Republicans— 14 or 29%

Prepared and Compiled by Senate Democratic Policy Committee
Robert C. Byrd, Chairman

Opponents maintained that decreased demands for electricity, increased uranium supplies at lower prices, and astronomical cost overruns have made it economically and technologically unsound to continue funding Clinch River. The House voted for the first time in 12 years to terminate its funding. While this project was originally scheduled for completion in 1983 at an estimated cost of $400 million, over $1 billion has already been invested and not one piling has been sunk; an additional $3.5 to $6 billion will be needed for completion. More economical energy alternatives include backfittable technology which could increase the uranium efficiency of existing nuclear powerplants by 15 percent. A new generation of uranium-efficient, advanced converter reactors could further reduce uranium consumption by up to 40 percent. Dismantling the project would not waste funds already expended since procured components have been tested and studied. Breeder reactor technology will not be economically feasible until the 21st century. Uranium costs would have to increase from $18 to $180 per pound to make funding Clinch River justifiable today. Most European countries have faced the current energy realities and the inherent safety problems with breeder reactors, and abandoned their projects. Even DOE's advisory board puts breeder reactor development as its lowest priority, and the utilities are not willing to invest additional funds. Breeder reactor R&D would not cease if the Clinch River project were terminated, they pointed out, since $325 million would remain in the budget for that purpose. Continued funding for Clinch River in the face of ever growing Federal deficits would be inexcusable.

SENATE VOTING RECORD

NO. 431

97th Congress
2nd Session

December 17, 1982, 8:08 a.m.
Session of December 16
Temp. Cong. Rec. p. S-15091

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, 1983

BILL NO.: H.J. Res. 631

SUBJECT: **Committee amendment striking the House appropriation of $1 billion to supplement the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) program to create jobs in local development projects in cities and urban counties.**

NOTE: Proponents insisted that the one-time CDBG supplement is not a jobs program despite its supporters' claims. Since nothing in its language guarantees that the money will be spent faster than usual, it can be expected to yield only two percent or $20 million in 1983 spending, creating too few jobs to justify the outyear problems and higher deficits. Additionally, the HUD-Independent Agencies appropriation has already been enacted. It is ironic, proponents argued, that in September, the House cut CDBG funds which the Senate Committee restored; now, three months later, the House chooses to add $1 billion. They noted that $426 million, nearly half the amount in the amendment, will be available in 1983 from unobligated 1982 funds.

Opponents contended that the CDBG supplement is the last chance for the Senate to enact an effective jobs program—the purported reason for this special legislative session. While the effectiveness of other jobs creation programs has been questioned, the CDBG program, because of its proven record, enjoys broad-based, bipartisan support. The $1 billion supplement would quickly be applied to the existing backlog of local projects that would produce real assets in communities across the country. They argued that all the funds, not $20 million, would be spent in 1983 because there is a vast difference between the "spendout" rate in a one-time effort such as this and an ongoing program. This expenditure would create between 150,000 and 200,000 jobs targeted to workers whose unemployment compensation has expired.

H.J. Res. 631: Vote Nos. 422-455, 459.

RESULT: AMENDMENT AGREED TO

YEAS (62)

Democrats (14 or 31%)

Bentsen
Boren
Byrd, Harry F., Jr.
Chiles
DeConcini
Exon
Ford
Heflin
Huddleston
Johnston
Nunn
Proxmire
Stennis
Zorinsky

Republicans (48 or 98%)

Abdnor
Andrews
Armstrong
Baker
Boschwitz
Chafee
Cochran
D'Amato
Danforth
Denton
Dole
Domenici
East
Garn
Gorton
Grassley
Hatfield
Hawkins
Hayakawa
Heinz
Helms
Humphrey
Jepsen
Kassebaum
Kasten
Laxalt
Lugar
Mattingly
McClure
Murkowski
Nickles
Packwood
Percy
Pressler
Quayle
Roth
Rudman
Schmitt
Simpson
Specter
Stafford
Stevens
Symms
Thurmond
Tower
Wallop
Warner
Weicker

NAYS (32)

Democrats (31 or 69%)

Baucus
Biden
Bradley
Bumpers
Burdick
Byrd, Robert C.
Cannon
Cranston
Dixon
Dodd
Eagleton
Hart
Hollings
Inouye
Jackson
Kennedy
Leahy
Levin
Long
Matsunaga
Melcher
Metzenbaum
Mitchell
Moynihan
Pell
Pryor
Randolph
Riegle
Sarbanes
Sasser
Tsongas

Republicans (1 or 2%)

Cohen

NOT VOTING (6)

Democrats (1)

Glenn—^{2}

Republicans (5)

Brady—^{2}
Durenberger—^{3}
Goldwater—^{2}
Hatch—$^{3\text{AY}}$
Mathias—^{2}

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

1—Official Business
2—Necessarily Absent
3—Illness
4—Other

SYMBOLS:

AY—Announced Yea
AN—Announced Nay
PY—Paired Yea
PN—Paired Nay

ANALYSIS OF ISSUE VOTED ON:

Party Cohesion	**Measure of Party Support on Issue as Voted on**	
	For (62)	*Against* (32)
Democrats— 69%	Democrats— 14 or 23%	Democrats— 31 or 97%
Republicans— 98%	Republicans— 48 or 77%	Republicans— 1 or 3%

Prepared and Compiled by Senate Democratic Policy Committee
Robert C. Byrd, Chairman

SENATE VOTING RECORD

NO. 432

97th Congress
2nd Session

December 17, 1982, 8:55 a.m.
Session of December 16
Temp. Cong. Rec. p. S-15096

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, 1983

BILL NO.: H.J. Res. 631

SUBJECT: **Committee amendment striking the $50 million House appropriation for the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) to carry out an emergency food and shelter program for the homeless through the United Way and representatives from the Salvation Army, Council of Churches, National Conference of Catholic Charities, Council of Jewish Federations and two others chosen by United Way, who would determine how to distribute funds to local voluntary organizations; making these funds available within 45 days of enactment and requiring that they be spent by the end of fiscal 1983; requiring FEMA to audit the program afterward; and limiting administrative costs to 2 percent.**

NOTE: Proponents agreed that the plight of the homeless and unemployed is serious but objected to the procedure adopted by the House and the precedent it would establish. The activities proposed for FEMA are neither within the scope of the Disaster Relief Act of 1974 nor Executive Order 12148 where civil emergencies are defined. Private organizations have never received Federal funding in this manner, despite numerous requests. Additionally, it would be impossible for FEMA to comply with the 45-day deadline since the law requires complete rulemaking to assure fairness, equal treatment, and due process which would take a minimum of 120 to 180 days. Neither this nor any Administration could implement the program as it stands and not violate the law. Existing HHS and USDA programs are better able to handle this type of distribution.

Opponents argued that new precedents should be established when there is urgent need to respond to the national disgrace of an estimated 250,000 to one million homeless people. Precedents and Executive Orders should not deter us from helping the needy who are jobless, hungry, cold, and without a roof

(OVER)

H.J. Res. 631: Vote Nos. 422-455, 459.

RESULT: AMENDMENT REJECTED

YEAS (43)

Democrats
(3 or 7%)

Byrd,
Harry F., Jr.
Proxmire
Zorinsky

Republicans
(40 or 80%)

Abdnor
Andrews
Armstrong
Baker
Boschwitz
Brady
D'Amato
Denton
Dole
Domenici
East
Garn
Gorton
Grassley
Hatfield
Hawkins
Helms
Humphrey
Jepsen
Kasten
Laxalt
Lugar
Mattingly
McClure
Murkowski
Nickles
Packwood
Percy
Quayle
Roth
Rudman
Schmitt
Stafford
Stevens
Symms
Thurmond
Tower
Wallop
Warner
Weicker

NAYS (52)

Democrats
(42 or 93%)

Baucus
Bentsen
Biden
Boren
Bradley
Bumpers
Burdick
Byrd,
Robert C.
Cannon
Chiles
Cranston
DeConcini
Dixon
Dodd
Eagleton
Exon
Ford
Hart
Heflin
Hollings
Huddleston
Inouye
Jackson
Johnston
Kennedy
Leahy
Levin
Long
Matsunaga
Melcher
Metzenbaum
Mitchell
Moynihan
Nunn
Pell
Pryor
Randolph
Riegle
Sarbanes
Sasser
Stennis
Tsongas

Republicans
(10 or 20%)

Chafee
Cochran
Cohen
Danforth
Hayakawa
Heinz
Kassebaum
Pressler
Simpson
Specter

NOT VOTING (5)

Democrats (1)

Glenn—^{2}

Republicans (4)

Durenberger—^{3}
Goldwater—^{2}
Hatch—^{3AN}
Mathias—^{2}

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

1—Official Business
2—Necessarily Absent
3—Illness
4—Other

SYMBOLS:

AY—Announced Yea
AN—Announced Nay
PY—Paired Yea
PN—Paired Nay

ANALYSIS OF ISSUE VOTED ON:

Party Cohesion	Measure of Party Support on Issue as Voted on	
	For (43)	*Against* (52)
Democrats— 93%	Democrats— 3 or 7%	Democrats— 42 or 81%
Republicans— 80%	Republicans— 40 or 93%	Republicans— 10 or 19%

Prepared and Compiled by Senate Democratic Policy Committee
Robert C. Byrd, Chairman

over their heads. The unemployed, many of whom are the "new poor," are trapped between the shortage of jobs and welfare laws that do not allow able-bodied persons to receive aid. Many have been dropped from disability roles due to last year's stepped-up review process, and many former mental patients have been released and are on the streets without permanent support. At the same time, State and Federal assistance has been reduced. This national problem demands an immediate national response. Bureaucratic inertia and rulemaking should not stand in the way of an Administration that claimed it could get things done. Volunteer organizations offered to help and believe they can do so quickly. Unemployment will not be reduced by urging people to "vote with their feet."

SENATE VOTING RECORD

NO. 438

97th Congress
2nd Session

December 17, 1982, 2:08 p.m.
Session of December 16
Temp. Cong. Rec. p. S-15136

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, 1983

BILL NO.: H.J. Res. 631

AMENDMENT NO.: UP 1512

SUBJECT: **Domenici-Baker-Dole, et al, amendment to strike the Title II—Jobs Package, which has an estimated cost of $1.163 billion.** (See also Vote Nos. 372 and 406)

NOTE: Proponents of the amendment asserted that the jobs package contained in this resolution, which they proposed to strike, as well as the House-passed $5.4 billion package, are essentially a hodge-podge of unconnected pork barrel projects and make-work jobs. The largest portion of the funds provided under both proposals would be spent in future years—not in 1983 when jobs are needed most. In order to respond to the needs of the unemployed, Congress should enact a second unemployment extension and a gas tax bill, which would create about 300,000 jobs in a well conceived and necessary effort to rebuild our highways and bridges. Regardless of the merit of the package now before the Senate, any further action should be delayed until the next Congress when a comprehensive program can be developed by the majority leadership. Furthermore, inclusion of a jobs program in this resolution would invite a veto by the President, threatening a shut-down of the government.

Opponents of the amendment contended that the Appropriations Committee package would create jobs needed to repair our Nation's deteriorating infrastructure. The package mainly appropriates funds for authorized projects which are engineered and ready to go such as: rural water and waste disposal, watershed, flood prevention, and economic development grants. The very nature of any construction project requires that money be obligated over the several years needed for completion. However, there has been no plan presented yet that has a more immediate job impact than the package contained in this resolution. Because of the likelihood that Congress will not complete action on the highway revenue and jobs bill, the Senate should support provisions to relieve the 12 million hard-working Americans who are currently unemployed. Furthermore, the very size of the House-passed jobs bill and its strong support in the other body dictates that the Senate resign itself to passage of a jobs package and stake out a responsible position for its conferees to defend. (See Vote Nos. 406 and 415 on Democratic initiatives to assist the unemployed.)

H.J. Res. 631: Vote Nos. 422-455, 459.

ADMINISTRATION POSITION: YEA

RESULT: **AMENDMENT REJECTED**

YEAS (46)

Democrats (7 or 16%)

Boren
Byrd,
Harry F., Jr.
Chiles
Exon
Nunn
Proxmire
Zorinsky

Republicans (39 or 76%)

Abdnor
Armstrong
Baker
Boschwitz
Brady
Danforth
Denton
Dole
Domenici
Durenberger
East
Garn
Gorton
Grassley
Hatch
Hawkins
Hayakawa
Helms
Humphrey
Jepsen

Kassebaum
Kasten
Laxalt
Lugar
Mattingly
McClure
Murkowski
Nickles
Percy
Pressler
Quayle
Roth
Simpson
Stafford
Stevens
Symms
Thurmond
Tower
Warner

NAYS (50)

Democrats (38 or 84%)

Baucus
Bentsen
Biden
Bradley
Bumpers
Burdick
Byrd,
Robert C.
Cannon
Cranston
DeConcini
Dixon
Dodd
Eagleton
Ford
Hart
Heflin
Hollings
Huddleston
Inouye

Jackson
Johnston
Kennedy
Leahy
Levin
Long
Matsunaga
Melcher
Metzenbaum
Mitchell
Moynihan
Pell
Pryor
Randolph
Riegle
Sarbanes
Sasser
Stennis
Tsongas

Republicans (12 or 24%)

Andrews
Chafee
Cochran
Cohen
D'Amato
Hatfield
Heinz
Packwood
Rudman
Schmitt
Specter
Weicker

NOT VOTING (4)

Democrats (1)

Glenn—2

Republicans (3)

Goldwater—2
Mathias—2
Wallop—2

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

1—Official Business
2—Necessarily Absent
3—Illness
4—Other

SYMBOLS:

AY—Announced Yea
AN—Announced Nay
PY—Paired Yea
PN—Paired Nay

ANALYSIS OF ISSUE VOTED ON:

Party Cohesion

Democrats— 84%
Republicans— 76%

Measure of Party Support on Issue as Voted on

For (46)
Democrats— 7 or 15%
Republicans— 39 or 85%

Against (50)
Democrats— 38 or 76%
Republicans— 12 or 24%

Prepared and Compiled by Senate Democratic Policy Committee
Robert C. Byrd, Chairman

SENATE VOTING RECORD

NO. 449

97th Congress
2nd Session

December 18, 1982, 6:00 p.m.
Temp. Cong. Rec. p. S-15418

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, 1983

BILL NO.: H.J. Res. 631

AMENDMENT NO.: UP 1559

SUBJECT: **Dole motion to table the Ford-Robert C. Byrd, et al. amendment to provide up to 10 weeks of supplemental unemployment insurance benefits for railroad workers with less than 10 years experience in order to correct the inadvertent repeal of the extended benefit program in the 1981 Budget Reconciliation Act. (See also Vote No. 450.)**

NOTE: Proponents of the amendment noted that railroad workers receive unemployment benefits in a program separate from the Federal-State unemployment insurance system. Under the Railroad Unemployment Insurance (RRUI) program, railroad workers with less than 10 years service are entitled to 26 weeks of basic unemployment benefits and an additional 13 weeks of extended benefits if conditions of high unemployment exist, as defined by the national trigger in the Federal-State program. But the national trigger was repealed by the 1981 Budget Reconciliation Act in order to change general unemployment law, which, in effect, deprived railworkers of extended benefits. Approximately 60,000 railworkers are currently ineligible for any benefits beyond the 26 weeks of basic compensation; many have exhausted that and have nowhere to turn. This emergency amendment would make them eligible to receive 6 to 10 weeks of Federal supplemental compensation until March 31, 1983, depending on the insured unemployment rate of the national economy. Congress has recognized the hardship facing other victims of an economy racked with high unemployment. It should also correct a mistake that is hurting these workers who, at best, are eligible for 39 weeks while others can receive up to 55 weeks. When the cost of the amendment is adjusted for savings in food stamps and taxes paid on benefits, it drops to about $42 million.

Opponents argued that the amendment would set an unfair and costly new precedent for extending coverage to workers not in the Federal-State program. In fact, they argued, the unions have fought to keep their system separate. Financing for RRUI has always been provided entirely from within the

(OVER)

H.J. Res. 631: Vote Nos. 422-455, 459.

RESULT: MOTION TO TABLE AGREED TO

YEAS (47)

Democrats (2 or 5%)

Byrd,
Harry F., Jr.
Long

Republicans (45 or 87%)

Abdnor
Andrews
Armstrong
Baker
Boschwitz
Brady
Chafee
Cochran
Cohen
Danforth
Denton
Dole
Domenici
East
Garn
Gorton
Grassley
Hatch
Hatfield
Hawkins
Hayakawa
Helms
Humphrey
Jepsen
Kassebaum
Kasten
Laxalt
Lugar
Mattingly
McClure
Murkowski
Nickles
Packwood
Pressler
Quayle
Rudman
Schmitt
Simpson
Stafford
Stevens
Symms
Thurmond
Tower
Wallop
Warner

NAYS (46)

Democrats (39 or 95%)

Baucus
Bentsen
Biden
Boren
Bradley
Bumpers
Burdick
Byrd,
Robert C.
Cannon
Chiles
DeConcini
Dixon
Dodd
Eagleton
Exon
Ford
Glenn
Heflin
Hollings
Huddleston
Inouye
Johnston
Leahy
Levin
Matsunaga
Melcher
Metzenbaum
Mitchell
Moynihan
Nunn
Proxmire
Pryor
Randolph
Riegle
Sarbanes
Sasser
Stennis
Tsongas
Zorinsky

Republicans (7 or 13%)

D'Amato
Durenberger
Mathias
Percy
Roth
Specter
Weicker

NOT VOTING (7)

Democrats (5)

Cranston—2
Hart—2
Jackson—2AN
Kennedy—2
Pell—2

Republicans (2)

Goldwater—2
Heinz—2AN

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

1—Official Business
2—Necessarily Absent
3—Illness
4—Other

SYMBOLS:

AY—Announced Yea
AN—Announced Nay
PY—Paired Yea
PN—Paired Nay

ANALYSIS OF ISSUE VOTED ON:

Party Cohesion	Measure of Party Support on Issue as Voted on	
	For (47)	*Against* (46)
Democrats— 95%	Democrats— 2 or 4%	Democrats— 39 or 85%
Republicans— 87%	Republicans— 45 or 96%	Republicans— 7 or 15%

Prepared and Compiled by Senate Democratic Policy Committee
Robert C. Byrd, Chairman

industry at a rate and with benefit standards different from the Federal-State program. In the beginning this would cost $85 million, plus $750,000 for administrative costs. A better way to restore eligibility for further benefits might be to amend RRUI to provide an internal trigger. Since the railroad unemployment trust fund currently owes over $300 million to the Federal Treasury, there may be reluctance to take that route. Moreover, this constitutes legislation on an appropriation bill.

SENATE VOTING RECORD

NO. 450

97th Congress
2nd Session

December 18, 1982, 6:22 p.m.
Temp. Cong. Rec. p. S-15419

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, 1983

BILL NO.: H.J. Res. 631

SUBJECT: **Ford motion to table the Hatfield motion to reconsider Vote No. 449 by which the Senate narrowly tabled the Ford-Robert C. Byrd, et al, amendment to provide up to 10 weeks of supplemental unemployment benefits for railroad workers with less than 10 years experience to correct the inadvertent repeal of the extended benefit program in the 1981 Budget Reconciliation Act.**

NOTE: Proponents of the amendment noted that railroad workers receive unemployment benefits in a program separate from the Federal-State unemployment insurance system. Under the Railroad Unemployment Insurance (RRUI) program, railroad workers with less than 10 years service are entitled to 26 weeks of basic unemployment benefits and an additional 13 weeks of extended benefits if conditions of high unemployment exist, as defined by the national trigger in the Federal-State program. But the national trigger was repealed by the 1981 Budget Reconciliation Act in order to change general unemployment law, which, in effect, deprived railworkers of extended benefits. Approximately 60,000 railworkers are currently ineligible for any benefits beyond the 26 weeks of basic compensation; many have exhausted that and have nowhere to turn. This emergency amendment would make them eligible to receive 6 to 10 weeks of Federal supplemental compensation until March 31, 1983, depending on the insured unemployment rate of the national economy. Congress has recognized the hardship facing other victims of an economy racked with high unemployment. It should also correct a mistake that is hurting these workers who, at best, are eligible for 39 weeks while others can receive up to 55 weeks. When the cost of the amendment is adjusted for savings in food stamps and taxes paid on benefits, it drops to about $42 million.

Opponents argued that the amendment would set an unfair and costly new precedent for extending coverage to workers not in the Federal-State program. In fact, they argued, the unions have fought to

(OVER)

H.J. Res. 631: Vote Nos. 422-455; 459.

RESULT: **MOTION TO TABLE AGREED TO**

YEAS (47)

Democrats (1 or 3%)

Byrd,
Harry F., Jr.

Republicans (46 or 88%)

Abdnor
Andrews
Armstrong
Baker
Boschwitz
Brady
Chafee
Cochran
Cohen
Danforth
Denton
Dole
Domenici
East
Garn
Gorton
Grassley
Hatch
Hatfield
Hawkins
Hayakawa
Helms
Humphrey
Jepsen
Kassebaum
Kasten
Laxalt
Lugar
Mattingly
McClure
Murkowski
Nickles
Packwood
Pressler
Quayle
Rudman
Schmitt
Simpson
Stafford
Stevens
Symms
Thurmond
Tower
Wallop
Warner
Weicker

NAYS (45)

Democrats (39 or 97%)

Baucus
Bentsen
Biden
Boren
Bradley
Bumpers
Burdick
Byrd,
Robert C.
Cannon
Chiles
DeConcini
Dixon
Eagleton
Exon
Ford
Hart
Heflin
Hollings
Huddleston
Inouye
Johnston
Leahy
Levin
Long
Matsunaga
Melcher
Metzenbaum
Mitchell
Moynihan
Nunn
Proxmire
Pryor
Randolph
Riegle
Sarbanes
Sasser
Stennis
Tsongas
Zorinsky

Republicans (6 or 12%)

D'Amato
Durenberger
Mathias
Percy
Roth
Specter

NOT VOTING (8)

Democrats (6)

Cranston—^{2}
Dodd—^{2}
Glenn—^{2}
Jackson—^{2AN}
Kennedy—^{2}
Pell—^{2}

Republicans (2)

Goldwater—^{2}
Heinz—^{2}

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

1—Official Business
2—Necessarily Absent
3—Illness
4—Other

SYMBOLS:

AY—Announced Yea
AN—Announced Nay
PY—Paired Yea
PN—Paired Nay

ANALYSIS OF ISSUE VOTED ON:

Party Cohesion	Measure of Party Support on Issue as Voted on: *For* (47)	*Against* (45)
Democrats— 97%	Democrats— 1 or 2%	Democrats— 39 or 87%
Republicans— 88%	Republicans— 46 or 98%	Republicans— 6 or 13%

Prepared and Compiled by Senate Democratic Policy Committee
Robert C. Byrd, Chairman

keep their system separate. Financing for RRUI has always been provided entirely from within the industry at a rate and with benefit standards different from the Federal-State program. In the beginning this would cost $85 million, plus $750,000 for administrative costs. A better way to restore eligibility for further benefits might be to amend RRUI to provide an internal trigger. Since the railroad unemployment trust fund currently owes over $300 million to the Federal Treasury, there may be reluctance to take that route. Moreover, this constitutes legislation on an appropriation bill.

SENATE VOTING RECORD

NO. 457

97th Congress
2nd Session

December 19, 1982, 6:33 p.m.
Temp. Cong. Rec. p. S-15597

GAS TAX—HIGHWAYS—JOBS

BILL NO.: H.R. 6211

AMENDMENT NO.: 5009

TITLE: "Surface Transportation Assistance Act of 1982."

SUBJECT: **Stafford motion to table the Nickles amendment striking the section of the bill which extends the Davis-Bacon prevailing wage rate provisions to workers on Federal highway 4R (resurfacing, restoration, rehabilitation, and reconstruction) projects.**

NOTE: Proponents of the amendment declared that Davis-Bacon causes higher unemployment and inflation and costs the government billions of dollars. Forcing State governments to comply with Davis-Bacon violates their Constitutional rights and significantly contributes to the rapid escalation of highway construction costs, according to testimony by State highway officials. The wage provisions of the Act impede the hiring of unskilled workers, minorities, and other highly unemployed sectors. Because of the excessive wages and high administrative costs resulting from the Act, Davis-Bacon discriminates against small contractors who cannot successfully bid on Federal contracts. The National Federation of Independent Businessmen supports its repeal and contends that the original need for the law, which was to protect local contractors from unfair competition during the Depression, no longer applies. Section 113 of the Federal Highway and Highway Revenue Acts of 1956 (H.R. 10660) clearly states that Davis-Bacon only applies to initial construction, and not to maintenance and repair, as established during the House debate on the original Act. If not repealed, the Act's jurisdiction certainly should not be extended. Since the cost of Davis-Bacon now far outweighs its benefits, extending its coverage to 4-R construction (resurfacing, restoration, rehabilitation, and reconstruction) would be expensive and counterproductive.

(OVER)

H.R. 6211: Vote Nos. 400-403, 406, 407, 409, 410, 412-421, 456-458, 460-469.

RESULT: **MOTION TO TABLE AGREED TO**

YEAS (48)

Democrats (33 or 79%)

Baucus
Bentsen
Biden
Bradley
Bumpers
Burdick
Byrd,
 Robert C.
DeConcini
Dixon
Dodd
Eagleton
Ford
Glenn
Hart
Heflin
Huddleston
Inouye
Johnston
Kennedy
Leahy
Levin
Long
Matsunaga
Melcher
Metzenbaum
Mitchell
Moynihan
Proxmire
Randolph
Riegle
Sarbanes
Sasser
Tsongas

Republicans (15 or 29%)

Andrews
Baker
Chafee
D'Amato
Danforth
Durenberger
Hatfield
Mathias
Murkowski
Packwood
Percy
Specter
Stafford
Stevens
Weicker

NAYS (46)

Democrats (9 or 21%)

Boren
Byrd,
 Harry F., Jr.
Chiles
Exon
Hollings
Nunn
Pryor
Stennis
Zorinsky

Republicans (37 or 71%)

Abdnor
Armstrong
Boschwitz
Brady
Cochran
Cohen
Denton
Dole
Domenici
East
Garn
Gorton
Grassley
Hatch
Hawkins
Hayakawa
Helms
Humphrey
Jepsen
Kassebaum
Kasten
Laxalt
Lugar
Mattingly
McClure
Nickles
Pressler
Quayle
Roth
Rudman
Schmitt
Simpson
Symms
Thurmond
Tower
Wallop
Warner

NOT VOTING (6)

Democrats (4)

Cannon—2
Cranston—2
Jackson—2AY
Pell—2AY

Republicans (2)

Goldwater—2
Heinz—2

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

1—Official Business
2—Necessarily Absent
3—Illness
4—Other

SYMBOLS:

AY—Announced Yea
AN—Announced Nay
PY—Paired Yea
PN—Paired Nay

ANALYSIS OF ISSUE VOTED ON:

Party Cohesion	Measure of Party Support on Issue as Voted on	
	For (48)	*Against* (46)
Democrats— 79%	Democrats— 33 or 69%	Democrats— 9 or 20%
Republicans— 71%	Republicans— 15 or 31%	Republicans— 37 or 80%

Prepared and Compiled by Senate Democratic Policy Committee
Robert C. Byrd, Chairman

Opponents of the amendment stated that the Davis-Bacon Act protects the standard of living for construction workers and protects States from suffering substandard highway work because of the use of lower paid, inexperienced workers. Davis-Bacon's competitive bidding procedures also provide for greater equality of bidding oppportunity, allowing small construction contractors, which includes many minorities, to effectively compete and win government contracts. Its retention is supported by the AFL-CIO Building Trades Union and the National Electrical Contractors Association. The Committee amendment does not seek to expand the Act's coverage but simply to reaffirm that it applies to all Federally-funded highway projects, not just original construction. Congress did not intend for the term "initial construction" to exclude any Federally-financed work from prevailing wage protections, opponents contended, and Congress enacted a clarifying amendment in 1976 to ensure that resurfacing, restoration, and rehabilitation were included within Davis-Bacon's jurisdiction. The deletion of the word "initial" as proposed by the Committee amendment will merely clarify the law's intent, and return interpretation of the Act to the status quo which existed for over 25 years before the FHA erroneously ruled in 1981 that 4-R projects were excluded.

SENATE VOTING RECORD

NO. 458

97th Congress
2nd Session

December 19, 1982, 7:55 p.m.
Temp. Cong. Rec. p. S-15605

GAS TAX—HIGHWAYS—JOBS

BILL NO.: H.R. 6211 **AMENDMENT NO.:** 5613

TITLE: "Surface Transportation Assistance Act of 1982."

SUBJECT: **Dole motion to table the Riegle-Bradley amendment exempting working families, with children, who earn less than $10,000 per year from the five-cent gas tax increase by application of an earned income tax credit.**

NOTE: Proponents of the amendment declared that it seeks to correct the regressive tax burden that the gasoline tax increase would place on American working families by increasing their Earned Income Tax Credit by approximately $25 a year per family. Although it represents a revenue loss of $65 million in 1984, decreasing $5 million each year thereafter through 1986, it would be better to lose these funds than to have that much spending power taken away from families who are officially designated as America's "working poor", and deprive them of their economic survival. These families function with a bare minimum and often drive older cars, which burn more gas per mile, making application of the tax even a greater burden to them. This bill already extends current exemptions at the increased rate for certain vehicles, including taxis and buses, and adds new exemptions for carpools and certain alcohol fuels. The least the Senate can do, they insisted, is to exempt families earning under $10,000 a year from the tax, especially since Congress has voted itself and top government officials a pay raise equal to many of these families' incomes.

Opponents of the amendment stated that this was a user tax and that some users should not subsidize persons who do not own or drive cars but who would benefit from the exemption. Although this amendment would merit consideration on a tax bill, some asserted, it is nongermane and should not be debated in this piece of major legislation. Others contended that the amendment was improperly drafted.

H.R. 6211: Vote Nos. 400-403, 406, 407, 409, 410, 412-421, 456-458, 460-469.

RESULT: **MOTION TO TABLE AGREED TO**

YEAS (50)

Democrats (3 or 7%)

Byrd, Harry F., Jr.
Melcher
Zorinsky

Republicans (47 or 92%)

Abdnor
Andrews
Armstrong
Baker
Boschwitz
Brady
Chafee
Cochran
D'Amato
Danforth
Denton
Dole
Domenici
Durenberger
Garn
Gorton
Grassley
Hatfield
Hawkins
Hayakawa
Helms
Jepsen
Kassebaum
Kasten
Laxalt
Lugar
Mathias
Mattingly
McClure
Murkowski
Nickles
Packwood
Percy
Pressler
Quayle
Roth
Rudman
Schmitt
Simpson
Stafford
Stevens
Symms
Thurmond
Tower
Wallop
Warner
Weicker

NAYS (42)

Democrats (38 or 93%)

Baucus
Biden
Boren
Bradley
Bumpers
Burdick
Byrd, Robert C.
Chiles
DeConcini
Dixon
Dodd
Eagleton
Exon
Ford
Glenn
Hart
Heflin
Hollings
Huddleston
Inouye
Johnston
Kennedy
Leahy
Levin
Long
Matsunaga
Metzenbaum
Mitchell
Moynihan
Nunn
Proxmire
Pryor
Randolph
Riegle
Sarbanes
Sasser
Stennis
Tsongas

Republicans (4 or 8%)

Cohen
East
Humphrey
Specter

NOT VOTING (8)

Democrats (5)

Bentsen—^{2}
Cannon—^{2}
Cranston—^{2}
Jackson—^{2AN}
Pell—^{2AN}

Republicans (3)

Goldwater—^{2}
Hatch—^{3}
Heinz—^{2}

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

1—Official Business
2—Necessarily Absent
3—Illness
4—Other

SYMBOLS:

AY—Announced Yea
AN—Announced Nay
PY—Paired Yea
PN—Paired Nay

ANALYSIS OF ISSUE VOTED ON:

Party Cohesion

Democrats— 93%
Republicans— 92%

Measure of Party Support on Issue as Voted on

For (50)
Democrats— 3 or 6%
Republicans— 47 or 94%

Against (42)
Democrats— 38 or 90%
Republicans— 4 or 10%

Prepared and Compiled by Senate Democratic Policy Committee
Robert C. Byrd. Chairman

SENATE VOTING RECORD

NO. 16

98th Congress
1st Session

March 11, 1983, 1:06 p.m.
Temp. Cong. Rec. p. S-2642

JOBS/SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1983

BILL NO.: H.R. 1718 **AMENDMENT NO.:** UP 36

SUBJECT: **Levin-Byrd, et al, amendment to create 280,000 new jobs through the addition of $1.665 billion to the Senate-reported bill for jobs creation (Community Development Block Grants—$1 billion, Older Americans Employment—$75 million, Summer Youth Employment—$100 million, and Economic Development Administration—$100 million), emergency food and shelter (humanitarian assistance through private charities—$50 million and municipal emergency shelter programs—$50 million), and emergency health care (Maternal and Child Health—$120 million, Community Health Centers—$70 million, and Preventive Health Services—$100 million).**

NOTE: Proponents of the amendment, which was developed under the auspices of the Democratic Task Force on Emergency Human Needs, contended that it would provide additional funds for worthy programs, most of which are already in the House version of the bill. The funds are necessary, they argued, to relieve the massive suffering caused by the worst recession since the 1930's. The Committee-reported bill represents a $1.3 billion cut over the House-passed measure and is well below the level that President Reagan has said he would accept. To propose fewer funds than President Reagan, who has blocked previous efforts to alleviate the worst effects of this recession, is unthinkable. Even with the additional funds, this amendment would be much more modest than past relief efforts for much less severe recessions. While the unemployment rate has apparently leveled off, 12 million American workers remain jobless. Clearly, the jobs and the relief provided by this amendment are necessary and will make this bill a meaningful starting point from which to base other emergency assistance efforts.

Opponents asserted that the additional funds provided by the amendment would invite the President's veto. Furthermore, many of its provisions have never been reviewed by the authorizing committee and could so encumber this bill with extraneous matters that it would fall of its own weight. Others characterized the amendment as economic "pump-priming" which has failed to stimulate the economy in the past because the money appropriated is never spent until recovery has been achieved.

H.R. 1718: Vote Nos. 12-27, 30, 44, 45.

RESULT: AMENDMENT REJECTED

YEAS (34)

Democrats (32 or 82%)

Baucus
Biden
Bingaman
Bradley
Bumpers
Burdick
Byrd
Chiles
Dixon
Dodd
Eagleton
Ford
Glenn
Huddleston
Inouye
Jackson
Kennedy
Lautenberg
Leahy
Levin
Long
Melcher
Metzenbaum
Mitchell
Moynihan
Pell
Pryor
Randolph
Riegle
Sarbanes
Sasser
Tsongas

Republicans (2 or 4%)

Mathias
Specter

NAYS (53)

Democrats (7 or 18%)

DeConcini
Exon
Heflin
Nunn
Proxmire
Stennis
Zorinsky

Republicans (46 or 96%)

Abdnor
Andrews
Baker
Boschwitz
Chafee
Cochran
Cohen
D'Amato
Danforth
Denton
Domenici
East
Garn
Goldwater
Gorton
Grassley
Hatch
Hatfield
Hawkins
Hecht
Heinz
Helms
Humphrey
Jepsen
Kassebaum
Kasten
Laxalt
Lugar
Mattingly
McClure
Murkowski
Nickles
Packwood
Percy
Pressler
Quayle
Roth
Rudman
Simpson
Stafford
Stevens
Thurmond
Trible
Wallop
Warner
Wilson

NOT VOTING (12)

Democrats (6)

Bentsen—2
Cranston—2PY
Hart—2
Hollings—2
Johnston—2
Matsunaga—2

Republicans (6)

Armstrong—2
Dole—2
Durenberger—2
Symms—2
Tower—2
Weicker—2

LIVE PAIRS (1)

PRESENT AND GIVING: **RECEIVING:**
Boren (PN)............................Cranston (PY)

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

1—Official Business
2—Necessarily Absent
3—Illness
4—Other

SYMBOLS:

PY—Paired Yea
PN—Paired Nay

ANALYSIS OF ISSUE VOTED ON:

Party Cohesion

Democrats— 82%
Republicans— 96%

Measure of Party Support on Issue as Voted on

For (34)
Democrats— 32 or 94%
Republicans— 2 or 6%

Against (53)
Democrats— 7 or 13%
Republicans— 46 or 87%

Prepared and Compiled by Senate Democratic Policy Committee
Robert C. Byrd, Chairman

SENATE VOTING RECORD

NO. 33

98th Congress
1st Session

March 18, 1983, 12:03 p.m.
Temp. Cong. Rec. p. S-3352

SOCIAL SECURITY REFORM

BILL NO.: H.R. 1900 **AMENDMENT NO.:** UP 91

TITLE: "Social Security Amendments of 1983."

SUBJECT: **Kennedy amendment removing the requirement that a State Medicaid cost containment program must have been established by July 1, 1981, in order for a State to qualify for a one percent lesser reduction in its Medicaid entitlement, pursuant to the Reconciliation Act of 1981, as an incentive to States to establish their own system to reduce hospital costs and thereby qualify for a lesser cut.**

NOTE: Proponents stated that this amendment would make any State that enacts a qualifying hospital cost review program that will reduce the rate of increase in hospital costs at least 2 percent below the national average eligible for the one percent lesser reduction in Medicaid entitlement benefits. A mere seven States met the July 1, 1981, qualifying deadline, while others that have since established programs, or are in the process or doing so, will be unfairly denied the lesser benefit reduction. Only 15 percent of savings accrued by the Federal government from these programs would be returned to the States, but the potential benefits to national health care are enormous; billions of dollars could be saved by Medicaid, Medicare, and other hospital programs. Congress has failed to confront the critical issue of health care inflation, and States should be supported in their efforts to deal with the problem. This bill is an appropriate vehicle for this amendment, proponents maintained, because it contains other significant provisions to encourage States to initiate cost containment programs.

Opponents declared that States already have enough incentives to establish rate setting systems, the most important one being the benefits of the system itself. Since States are eventually going to establish cost containment programs anyway, they maintained, Congress should not add $57 million to the deficit in FY 1984, and as much as $160 million in future years, by agreeing to this amendment. This issue should be considered during the Medicaid budget process, they added, rather than to a bill dealing with Medicare reimbursement

H.R. 1900: Vote Nos. 28, 29, 31-43, 46-54.

RESULT: AMENDMENT REJECTED

YEAS (28)			NAYS (64)			NOT VOTING (8)	
Democrats (28 or 68%)		**Republicans (0 or 0%)**	**Democrats (13 or 32%)**	**Republicans (51 or 100%)**		**Democrats (5)**	**Republicans (3)**
Bentsen	Lautenberg		Baucus	Abdnor	Kassebaum	Biden—^{4}	Goldwater—^{2}
Bingaman	Leahy		Boren	Andrews	Kasten	Bumpers—^{2}	Mathias—^{4}
Bradley	Levin		DeConcini	Armstrong	Laxalt	Cranston—^{2}	Quayle—^{2}
Burdick	Matsunaga		Dixon	Baker	Lugar	Hart—^{2}	
Byrd	Melcher		Exon	Boschwitz	Mattingly	Hollings—^{2}	
Chiles	Metzenbaum		Heflin	Chafee	McClure		
Dodd	Mitchell		Johnston	Cochran	Murkowski		
Eagleton	Moynihan		Long	Cohen	Nickles		
Ford	Nunn		Proxmire	D'Amato	Packwood		
Glenn	Pell		Pryor	Danforth	Percy		
Huddleston	Randolph		Sasser	Denton	Pressler		
Inouye	Riegle		Stennis	Dole	Roth		
Jackson	Sarbanes		Zorinsky	Domenici	Rudman		
Kennedy	Tsongas			Durenberger	Simpson		
				East	Specter		
				Garn	Stafford		
				Gorton	Stevens		
				Grassley	Symms		
				Hatch	Thurmond		
				Hatfield	Tower		
				Hawkins	Trible		
				Hecht	Wallop		
				Heinz	Warner		
				Helms	Weicker		
				Humphrey	Wilson		
				Jepsen			

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

1—Official Business
2—Necessarily Absent
3—Illness
4—Other

SYMBOLS:

AY—Announced Yea
AN—Announced Nay
PY—Paired Yea
PN—Paired Nay

ANALYSIS OF ISSUE VOTED ON:

Party Cohesion

Democrats— 68%
Republicans— 100%

Measure of Party Support on Issue as Voted on

For (28)
Democrats— 28 or 100%
Republicans— 0 or 0%

Against (64)
Democrats— 13 or 20%
Republicans— 51 or 80%

Prepared and Compiled by Senate Democratic Policy Committee
Robert C. Byrd, Chairman

32-733 O - 84 - 4

SENATE VOTING RECORD

NO. 35

98th Congress
1st Session

March 21, 1983, 2:44 p.m.
Temp. Cong. Rec. p. S-3478

SOCIAL SECURITY REFORM

BILL NO.: H.R. 1900

AMENDMENT NO.: 520

TITLE: "Social Security Amendments of 1983."

SUBJECT: **Bradley, et al, amendment (to the Committee amendment) to provide disability benefits to persons aged 62 and above who are unable to continue to engage in their current occupation or employment, which would become effective in the year 2000, insuring that persons in ill health will not be adversely affected by increasing the retirement age.**

NOTE: Proponents pointed out that some workers, particularly those with poor health in difficult professions—where manual labor, occupational strain or hazards are real threats to their well-being—may not be able to continue working despite advances in average longevity. They should not be penalized as a result of the raised retirement age and early retirement benefit reductions. In many cases, these are workers least able to afford reductions. Under the amendment, such early retirees would receive 80 percent of their benefits, as under current law, rather than 75 percent as in the Committee bill. Workers would qualify if they could demonstrate inability to perform the major occupation they held during the 10 years before the onset of their disability. Program growth or abuse would be limited because of its relatively small eligibility pool of 6 million persons aged 62 to 66 and its modest benefit increase of roughly $35 to $50 per month. The cost of the program is estimated to be $600 million a year out of the OASDI trust fund, or .04 per cent of taxable payroll, which could be easily accommodated by the savings in the bill. This amendment responds to the Commission's assumption that improvements would be made in the disability program prior to implementation of a higher retirement age, to take into account the special problems of those between 62 and the normal retirement age who cannot extend their working careers for health reasons. Its adoption would set future retirees' minds at ease regarding Congressional intent.

(OVER)

H.R. 1900: Vote Nos. 28, 29, 31-43, 46-54.

RESULT: AMENDMENT REJECTED

YEAS (30)

Democrats
(30 or 68%)

Biden
Bingaman
Bradley
Burdick
Byrd
Chiles
DeConcini
Dodd
Eagleton
Ford
Glenn
Heflin
Hollings
Inouye
Jackson
Kennedy
Lautenberg
Levin
Matsunaga
Melcher
Metzenbaum
Mitchell
Pell
Proxmire
Randolph
Riegle
Sarbanes
Sasser
Tsongas
Zorinsky

Republicans
(0 or 0%)

NAYS (61)

Democrats
(14 or 32%)

Baucus
Bentsen
Boren
Bumpers
Dixon
Exon
Huddleston
Johnston
Leahy
Long
Moynihan
Nunn
Pryor
Stennis

Republicans
(47 or 100%)

Abdnor
Andrews
Armstrong
Baker
Boschwitz
Chafee
Cochran
Cohen
D'Amato
Danforth
Denton
Dole
Durenberger
East
Garn
Goldwater
Gorton
Grassley
Hatch
Hatfield
Hawkins
Hecht
Heinz
Helms
Humphrey
Jepsen
Kassebaum
Kasten
Laxalt
Lugar
Mattingly
McClure
Murkowski
Nickles
Percy
Roth
Rudman
Simpson
Specter
Stafford
Stevens
Symms
Thurmond
Trible
Warner
Weicker
Wilson

NOT VOTING (9)

Democrats (2)

Cranston—[2]
Hart—[2]

Republicans (7)

Domenici—[2]
Mathias—[4]
Packwood—[4]
Pressler—[2]
Quayle—[2]
Tower—[2]
Wallop—[2]

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

1—Official Business
2—Necessarily Absent
3—Illness
4—Other

SYMBOLS:

AY—Announced Yea
AN—Announced Nay
PY—Paired Yea
PN—Paired Nay

ANALYSIS OF ISSUE VOTED ON:

Party Cohesion

Democrats— 68%
Republicans— 100%

Measure of Party Support on Issue as Voted on

For (30)
Democrats— 30 or 100%
Republicans— 0 or 0%

Against (61)
Democrats— 14 or 23%
Republicans— 47 or 77%

Prepared and Compiled by Senate Democratic Policy Committee
Robert C. Byrd, Chairman

Opponents argued that there is no reason to rush since the program would not go into effect until 2000. There have been no hearings on liberalizing benefit eligibility or setting up what amounts to an "occupational disability" program. Urging caution, they pointed to past experience which produced a disability program three times the size originally contemplated. Judges and administrative personnel who have handled the program have been sympathetically inclined toward applicants, even those found not to be totally and permanently disabled who were never intended to receive benefits. Passage of this amendment would indicate that Congress is not serious about adhering to the strict statutory definition of disability. Congress has been too generous in the past, making the painful provisions of this compromise necessary. The House bill requires HHS to report to Congress by January 1, 1986, on the implications of raising the retirement age for people in physically demanding jobs and those with health problems; it would contain any recommendations the Secretary finds necessary or desirable. In addition, the surplus in the bill may be only hypothetical and cannot be depended upon to pay for the many amendments that will be offered.

SENATE VOTING RECORD

NO. 38

98th Congress
1st Session

March 22, 1983, 3:51 p.m.
Temp. Cong. Rec. p. S-3586

SOCIAL SECURITY REFORM

BILL NO.: H.R. 1900 **AMENDMENT NO.:** 531

TITLE: "Social Security Amendments of 1983."

SUBJECT: **Moynihan motion to table the Melcher motion to waive the provisions of titles III and IV of the Budget Act in order to permit the consideration of the Melcher amendment—Vote Nos. 36 and 37—to delay implementation of withholding on interest and dividends from July 1, 1983, to January 1, 1984.** (Subsequently, the Chair ruled the amendment out of order under section 311 of the Budget Act.)

NOTE: Proponents of the motion to waive the Budget Act questioned the efficacy of the agreement to consider the repeal of withholding on a Senate-originated revenue bill because it would likely be rejected by the House on Constitutional grounds. (See the note on Vote No. 27 for the agreement to take up the repeal during consideration of the trade reciprocity bill.) Considering that the Speaker of the House, the Majority Leader of the Senate, the Chairmen of both tax committees, and the President all oppose repeal, any withholding amendment must be attached to an important bill that is unlikely to be delayed or vetoed. Objections that this amendment violates the Budget Act because it reduces revenues are irrelevant since similar objections were waived with respect to provisions of the bill that cost over $2 billion. The cost of deferring withholding for this brief period of study, therefore, should not prove an obstacle to this amendment's consideration.

Opponents of the motion to waive the Budget Act argued that this amendment violates section 311 of the Act because it would reduce revenue in FY 1983 below the floor set in the budget resolution now in effect. This amendment is merely an interim step towards repeal of withholding on interest and dividends which would necessitate finding $20 billion in additional revenue over the next five years. The budget waiver previously granted was merited because it is necessary to pass emergency legislation in an expeditious manner. Others argued that the agreement to consider withholding on April 15 was made in good faith, and consideration of this issue now should not be allowed to delay speedy passage of the bipartisan compromise to save social security.

H.R. 1900: Vote Nos. 28, 29, 31-43, 46-53, 46-54.

RESULT: **MOTION TO TABLE AGREED TO**

YEAS (54)

Democrats (13 or 30%)

Bentsen
Bingaman
Chiles
Dodd
Hart
Jackson
Kennedy
Lautenberg
Leahy
Metzenbaum
Moynihan
Pell
Stennis

Republicans (41 or 77%)

Abdnor
Andrews
Baker
Boschwitz
Chafee
Cochran
Cohen
D'Amato
Danforth
Dole
Domenici
Durenberger
Garn
Goldwater
Gorton
Grassley
Hatch
Hatfield
Hawkins
Hecht
Heinz
Kassebaum
Laxalt
Lugar
Mathias
McClure
Murkowski
Packwood
Pressler
Roth
Rudman
Specter
Stafford
Stevens
Thurmond
Tower
Trible
Wallop
Warner
Weicker
Wilson

NAYS (43)

Democrats (31 or 70%)

Baucus
Biden
Boren
Bradley
Bumpers
Burdick
Byrd
DeConcini
Dixon
Eagleton
Exon
Ford
Glenn
Heflin
Hollings
Huddleston
Inouye
Johnston
Levin
Long
Matsunaga
Melcher
Mitchell
Nunn
Proxmire
Pryor
Randolph
Riegle
Sasser
Tsongas
Zorinsky

Republicans (12 or 23%)

Armstrong
Denton
East
Helms
Humphrey
Jepsen
Kasten
Mattingly
Nickles
Percy
Quayle
Symms

NOT VOTING (3)

Democrats (2)

Cranston—2
Sarbanes—2

Republicans (1)

Simpson—2

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

1—Official Business
2—Necessarily Absent
3—Illness
4—Other

SYMBOLS:

AY—Announced Yea
AN—Announced Nay
PY—Paired Yea
PN—Paired Nay

ANALYSIS OF ISSUE VOTED ON:

Party Cohesion	Measure of Party Support on Issue as Voted on	
	For (54)	*Against* (43)
Democrats— 70%	Democrats— 13 or 24%	Democrats— 31 or 72%
Republicans— 77%	Republicans— 41 or 76%	Republicans— 12 or 28%

Prepared and Compiled by Senate Democratic Policy Committee
Robert C. Byrd, Chairman

SENATE VOTING RECORD

NO. 39

98th Congress
1st Session

March 22, 1983, 5:41 p.m.
Temp. Cong. Rec. p. S-3602

SOCIAL SECURITY REFORM

BILL NO.: H.R. 1900 **AMENDMENT NO.:** 528

TITLE: "Social Security Amendments of 1983."

SUBJECT: **Domenici motion to table the Heinz motion to waive section 306 of the Budget Act (prohibiting floor consideration of any matter within the jurisdiction of the Budget Committee unless it has been reported or discharged by the Budget Committee) to allow consideration of the Heinz amendment to create separate functional categories for the social security trust funds, effective FY 1985, and to remove the OASI and DI Trust Funds from the unified budget beginning in FY 1989.** (See also Vote No. 40.)

NOTE: *Proponents of the amendment stated that removing the social security trust funds from the unified budget would: insure that any changes in benefits, coverage, financing, or administrative expenses would be enacted purely on the basis of program considerations, and not in an effort to reduce Federal deficits; eliminate public skepticism over the stability of the social security system and its vulnerability to political and budgetary struggles; and insure fair decisions on both the budget and social security issues by providing a clearer picture of available alternatives and the effects of any changes. Inclusion of the trust funds in the unified budget has made social security seem more like discretionary spending than a social insurance program with its own dedicated taxes and financing reserves. Social security deficits are added to the growing deficits, and its surpluses can mask other problems. Thus the trust funds, with their 35 million beneficiaries and 10 million contributors, are immense targets for budget cuts since a small change can quickly result in substantial budgetary savings or outlays. The social security program must be judged over a much longer time period than the budget, they declared.*

(OVER)

H.R. 1900: Vote Nos. 28, 29, 31-43, 46-54.

RESULT: **MOTION TO TABLE AGREED TO**

YEAS (56)

Democrats (12 or 27%)

Bentsen
Bingaman
Chiles
Dixon
Exon
Heflin
Hollings
Huddleston
Johnston
Nunn
Proxmire
Zorinsky

Republicans (44 or 85%)

Abdnor
Andrews
Armstrong
Baker
Boschwitz
Chafee
Cochran
Cohen
D'Amato
Denton
Dole
Domenici
East
Garn
Goldwater
Gorton
Grassley
Hatfield
Hawkins
Hecht
Jepsen
Kassebaum
Kasten
Lugar
Mathias
Mattingly
McClure
Murkowski
Nickles
Packwood
Quayle
Roth
Rudman
Simpson
Stafford
Stevens
Symms
Thurmond
Tower
Trible
Wallop
Warner
Weicker
Wilson

NAYS (41)

Democrats (33 or 73%)

Baucus
Biden
Boren
Bradley
Bumpers
Burdick
Byrd
Cranston
DeConcini
Dodd
Eagleton
Ford
Glenn
Hart
Inouye
Jackson
Kennedy
Lautenberg
Leahy
Levin
Long
Matsunaga
Melcher
Metzenbaum
Mitchell
Moynihan
Pell
Pryor
Randolph
Riegle
Sasser
Stennis
Tsongas

Republicans (8 or 15%)

Danforth
Durenberger
Hatch
Heinz
Helms
Humphrey
Pressler
Specter

NOT VOTING (3)

Democrats (1)

Sarbanes—^{2}

Republicans (2)

Laxalt—^{2}
Percy—^{2AN}

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

1—Official Business
2—Necessarily Absent
3—Illness
4—Other

SYMBOLS:

AY—Announced Yea
AN—Announced Nay
PY—Paired Yea
PN—Paired Nay

ANALYSIS OF ISSUE VOTED ON:

Party Cohesion

Democrats— 73%
Republicans— 85%

Measure of Party Support on Issue as Voted on

For (56)
Democrats— 12 or 21%
Republicans— 44 or 79%

Against (41)
Democrats— 33 or 80%
Republicans— 8 or 20%

Prepared and Compiled by Senate Democratic Policy Committee
Robert C. Byrd, Chairman

which has a 3 to 5 year prospectus. Although the system is now suffering a major funding crisis, it is estimated that by 2020 up to $3 trillion in surplus social security funds will be collected. These surplus funds must be stockpiled in order to protect the program's solvency when the "baby boom" generation becomes eligible for benefits. As part of the unified budget, however, the trust funds will be tempting accounts to use for whatever programs may then need additional funding. The National Commissions on Social Security of 1981 and 1983 endorsed removing the trust funds from the unified budget, as they were prior to 1968, and their removal would not hinder Congress' ability to evaluate the economic effects of social security spending or to establish fiscal policy. A consolidated summary of the administrative and trust fund budget could be printed, as it was before FY 1969, with a clear presentation of the overall effect of Federal financial receipts, disbursements, and other operations.

Opponents of the amendment declared that the comprehensive budget should be as inclusive of Federal activities as possible in order for Congress to make informed decisions regarding budgetary policy. The Presidential Commission on Budgetary Concepts recommended a unified budget after determining that separate and competing budgets confused Congress and the public, impeded the budgetary process, and hindered Congress' ability to forecast the economic impact of fiscal policy. Trust funds represent one-third of the budget and 35 percent of budgetary Federal spending and taxation; removing the social security trust funds would set an unfortunate precedent and make the public think that Congress is manipulating the budget in an effort to hide something. It could also lead to greater Presidential power over Federal spending levels since impoundment authority could be utilized whenever Congress is deemed not to be responsibly legislating fiscal policy. Recent changes in social security were not merely to decrease the budget deficit, they pointed out, but to financially aid the ailing systems' critically low reserves. Removing the trust funds from the budget would increase problems by making it more difficult to infuse general revenues into the system and decreasing the options for dealing with future financing crises. The American Association of Retired Persons has urged that the funds remain integrated into the budget because, as separate categories, drastic short-term benefit cuts or large payroll tax increases would be the only methods for dealing with the system's solvency problems.

SENATE VOTING RECORD

NO. 48

98th Congress
1st Session

March 23, 1983. 2:55 p.m.
Temp. Cong. Rec. p. S-3720

SOCIAL SECURITY REFORM

BILL NO.: H.R. 1900

AMENDMENT NO.: UP 128

TITLE: "Social Security Amendments of 1983."

SUBJECT: **Stevens-Dole-Baker amendment (as a substitute for the Long, et al, amendment) requiring social security coverage for those Federal employees hired after December 31, 1983 (but not requiring them to pay into civil service); directing Congress to enact a supplemental civil service retirement program by October 1, 1985, which would enable new employees to receive free credit under the new program for their service; providing that if Congress fails to enact a new supplemental program by October 1, 1985, new Federal employees (hired in 1984) will be covered by both social security and civil service (at a contribution rate of 14%) and be given free credit under civil service for service up to October 1, 1985.** (Subsequently, the Long, et al, amendment was adopted by voice vote. It defers coverage of Federal employees—but not the President, Vice President, Members of Congress, or the Social Security Commissioner—until a supplemental retirement program is in place. It, however, was omitted from the conference report.)

NOTE: Proponents of the Stevens substitute amendment argued that by providing a date certain for establishment of the system, Federal employees would have an incentive to cooperate in formulating a new system. In return, the Stevens amendment eliminates the concern that new employees would be forced to pay into both the current civil service system and the social security system by allowing Congress 2 1/2 years to establish a new supplemental system. Second, the Stevens amendment would give newly hired Federal employees retroactive credit upon establishment of the new supplemental system. Third, should no supplemental system be enacted by October 1, 1985, the retroactive contributions would be made to the regular civil service retirement fund, resolving concerns about the

(OVER)

H.R. 1900: Vote Nos. 28, 29, 31-43, 46-54.

RESULT: **AMENDMENT REJECTED**

YEAS (45)

Democrats (4 or 10%)

Bradley
Chiles
Lautenberg
Metzenbaum

Republicans (41 or 77%)

Abdnor
Baker
Chafee
Cohen
Danforth
Denton
Dole
Durenberger
Garn
Gorton
Grassley
Hatch
Hatfield
Hecht
Heinz
Helms
Humphrey
Jepsen
Kassebaum
Kasten
Laxalt
Lugar
Mathias
Mattingly
McClure
Murkowski
Nickles
Packwood
Percy
Quayle
Roth
Rudman
Simpson
Stafford
Stevens
Symms
Thurmond
Tower
Wallop
Weicker
Wilson

NAYS (50)

Democrats (38 or 90%)

Baucus
Bentsen
Biden
Bingaman
Boren
Bumpers
Burdick
Byrd
Cranston
Dixon
Dodd
Eagleton
Exon
Ford
Glenn
Hart
Heflin
Huddleston
Inouye
Jackson
Johnston
Leahy
Levin
Long
Matsunaga
Melcher
Mitchell
Nunn
Pell
Proxmire
Pryor
Randolph
Riegle
Sarbanes
Sasser
Stennis
Tsongas
Zorinsky

Republicans (12 or 23%)

Andrews
Armstrong
Boschwitz
Cochran
D'Amato
Domenici
East
Goldwater
Pressler
Specter
Trible
Warner

NOT VOTING (4)

Democrats (3)

DeConcini—^{2}
Hollings—^{2}
Kennedy—^{2PN}

Republicans (1)

Hawkins—^{2}

LIVE PAIRS (1)

PRESENT AND GIVING: **RECEIVING:**

Moynihan (PY) .... Kennedy (PN)

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

1—Official Business
2—Necessarily Absent
3—Illness
4—Other

SYMBOLS:

AY—Announced Yea
AN—Announced Nay
PY—Paired Yea
PN—Paired Nay

ANALYSIS OF ISSUE VOTED ON:

Party Cohesion

Democrats— 90%
Republicans— 77%

Measure of Party Support on Issue as Voted on

For (45)
Democrats— 4 or 9%
Republicans— 41 or 91%

Against (50)
Democrats— 38 or 76%
Republicans— 12 or 24%

Prepared and Compiled by Senate Democratic Policy Committee
Robert C. Byrd. Chairman

current civil service system's funding. In contrast, the Long amendment is being supported by Federal employees in an effort to avoid coverage under social security permanently. The Long amendment would eliminate any incentive for Federal employees to cooperate in devising and enacting a supplemental system because, in the absence of action by Congress, the status quo desired by Federal workers would be preserved.

Opponents argued that the Stevens substitute would still make coverage under social security mandatory, whether or not a supplemental civil service program has been enacted. In the absence of Congressional action, new employees would be forced to pay 6.75 percent of their salary for social security and 7 percent for the current retirement system by October 1, 1985. Alternatively, the Administration could use promised support for a supplemental program as a lever to ram through major cuts in the Federal civil service retirement system without fair consideration. The reluctance of Federal workers to accept an undefined supplementary system is justified in light of the Administration's proposals to cut the cost of the civil service retirement fund by 37 percent while requiring Federal employees to contribute 50 percent more. Establishment of an inferior supplemental benefit system would create pressure to pare down the benefits under the current retirement system. The Long amendment would provide Federal employees a better opportunity to participate in the design of the new system to supplement social security benefits and to protect the benefits of current employees. It is consistent with the Presidential Commission's compromise, which assumed enactment of a supplemental system to protect Federal employees from benefit reductions. Actuarial projections of deficits resulting from adoption of the Long amendment are based on the erroneous assumption that no supplementary benefits will be enacted, and therefore, that no new Federal employees will begin to contribute to the social security system.

SENATE VOTING RECORD

NO. 49

98th Congress
1st Session

March 23, 1983, 3:51 p.m.
Temp. Cong. Rec. p. S-3725

SOCIAL SECURITY REFORM

BILL NO.: H.R. 1900

AMENDMENT NO.: UP 129

TITLE: "Social Security Amendments of 1983."

SUBJECT: **Armstrong amendment (as a substitute for the Baucus amendment which strikes section 148 accelerating the deposit of payroll taxes by State and local governments) requiring that after December 1983, social security taxes withheld by State and local governments shall be collected by the IRS, according to deposit requirements that apply to private employers.**

NOTE: Proponents pointed out that local governments currently submit their social security taxes through State governments. Paying IRS directly, as Federal income taxes are presently paid, would equalize treatment between units of local government and private employers, they contended. Small government entities would be treated the same as comparable small businesses, including the liberalized treatment afforded small business by earlier amendments. The underlying amendment would instead restore the current situation which favors governmental units over private employers.

Opponents argued that there has been insufficient discussion of this provision which is bound to cause chaos for local governments not accustomed to dealing directly with the IRS, and who have not had an opportunity to express their views. In an effort to increase revenue, the bill accelerates State and local payments in the next fiscal year—a plan that was soundly rejected in 1978 when Congress examined its merits and went on to adopt the monthly withholding requirement now in force. At the same time, Congress also concluded that State collections made sense. The substitute does not meet the objections in the underlying amendment. Instead of providing relief, this amendment changes the collection system with neither hearing nor transition period.

This amendment was omitted in the conference report.

H.R. 1900: Vote Nos. 28, 29, 31-43, 46-54.

RESULT: AMENDMENT AGREED TO

YEAS (49)

Democrats (6 or 14%)

Chiles
Inouye
Jackson
Johnston
Nunn
Proxmire

Republicans (43 or 81%)

Armstrong
Baker
Boschwitz
Chafee
Cochran
Cohen
Danforth
Dole
Domenici
Durenberger
East
Garn
Goldwater
Gorton
Grassley
Hatch
Hatfield
Hawkins
Hecht
Heinz
Helms
Humphrey
Jepsen
Kassebaum
Kasten
Laxalt
Lugar
Mattingly
Murkowski
Nickles
Packwood
Quayle
Rudman
Simpson
Stafford
Stevens
Thurmond
Tower
Trible
Wallop
Warner
Weicker
Wilson

NAYS (48)

Democrats (38 or 86%)

Baucus
Bentsen
Biden
Bingaman
Boren
Bradley
Bumpers
Burdick
Byrd
Cranston
DeConcini
Dixon
Dodd
Eagleton
Exon
Ford
Glenn
Hart
Heflin
Huddleston
Lautenberg
Leahy
Levin
Long
Matsunaga
Melcher
Metzenbaum
Mitchell
Moynihan
Pell
Pryor
Randolph
Riegle
Sarbanes
Sasser
Stennis
Tsongas
Zorinsky

Republicans (10 or 19%)

Abdnor
Andrews
D'Amato
Denton
McClure
Percy
Pressler
Roth
Specter
Symms

NOT VOTING (3)

Democrats (2)

Hollings—2
Kennedy—2

Republicans (1)

Mathias—2

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

1—Official Business
2—Necessarily Absent
3—Illness
4—Other

SYMBOLS:

AY—Announced Yea
AN—Announced Nay
PY—Paired Yea
PN—Paired Nay

ANALYSIS OF ISSUE VOTED ON:

Party Cohesion	**Measure of Party Support on Issue as Voted on** *For* (49)	*Against* (48)
Democrats— 86%	Democrats— 6 or 12%	Democrats— 38 or 79%
Republicans— 81%	Republicans— 43 or 88%	Republicans— 10 or 21%

Prepared and Compiled by Senate Democratic Policy Committee
Robert C. Byrd, Chairman

SENATE VOTING RECORD

NO. 50

98th Congress
1st Session

March 23, 1983, 5:58 p.m.
Temp. Cong. Rec. p. S-3738

SOCIAL SECURITY REFORM

BILL NO.: H.R. 1900 **AMENDMENT NO.:** UP 133

TITLE: "Social Security Amendments of 1983."

SUBJECT: **Long amendment striking the Committee provision which counts interest earned on tax-exempt State and municipal bonds in computing adjusted gross income (AGI) for the purpose of taxing social security benefits.** (See also Vote Nos. 43 and 46 on taxing benefits.)

NOTE: Proponents of the amendment contended that the Committee provision amounts to an unconstitutional tax on bonds. In the 1895 case of Pollock v. Farmers Loan and Trust Company, the Supreme Court held that such a tax constituted an encroachment on one of the sovereign powers of the State in violation of the principle set forth in McCulloch v. Maryland. It was held that to preserve the Federal system, Federal, State, and local governments must have reciprocal immunity from taxation. Adoption of the Sixteenth Amendment in 1913, empowering the Federal Government to levy taxes on income from any source, might have neutralized the effect of Pollock, were it not for the strong legislative history indicating that the amendment was not to be construed to permit taxation on State and local bond interest. Proponents argued that this provision could hurt middle-income aged people, by boosting their AGI into a category that would make half their benefits taxable, but it would not affect the rich, whose benefits would probably already be subject to tax on the basis of other income; therefore, it closes no loopholes. Municipal bond markets would be depressed, however, because the bonds would be less attractive. Consequently, local governments would have to pay more to borrow or replace borrowing with taxes; the cost, in either case, would be passed on to the middle class and those on social security. The meager amount raised by this provision, $5 million over 7 years, would likely be offset by the cost of administration, and to collect it, tax forms would have to be more complex, even for those with no bond income.

Opponents argued that the primary goal of this provision, supported 12-4 in Committee, is not revenue but equity. If the tax revision in the bill is to be fair, it must be a mandatory tax for all similarly situated taxpayers. It cannot be compulsory for those with illiquid investments, taxable pensions, trust income or wages, and voluntary for those with the ability and inclination to convert a small portion of their current taxable income into tax-exempt income, solely to escape taxes on their benefits. This provision helps keep the bill as neutral as possible, by not creating new incentives to buy municipal bonds.

H.R. 1900: Vote Nos. 28, 29, 31-43, 46-54.

RESULT: **AMENDMENT REJECTED**

YEAS (44)			NAYS (52)			NOT VOTING (4)	
Democrats (29 or 66%)		**Republicans (15 or 29%)**	**Democrats (15 or 34%)**	**Republicans (37 or 71%)**		**Democrats (2)**	**Republicans (2)**
Baucus	Johnston	Armstrong	Biden	Abdnor	Kassebaum	Hollings—^{2}	Goldwater—^{2}
Bentsen	Leahy	Boschwitz	Boren	Andrews	Laxalt	Kennedy—^{2}	Mathias—^{2}
Bingaman	Long	Cochran	Bradley	Baker	Lugar		
Bumpers	Matsunaga	D'Amato	Chiles	Chafee	Mattingly		
Burdick	Melcher	East	Eagleton	Cohen	McClure		
Byrd	Moynihan	Hawkins	Exon	Danforth	Nickles		
Cranston	Proxmire	Helms	Hart	Denton	Packwood		
DeConcini	Pryor	Kasten	Jackson	Dole	Percy		
Dixon	Randolph	Murkowski	Lautenberg	Domenici	Quayle		
Dodd	Riegle	Pressler	Levin	Durenberger	Roth		
Ford	Sarbanes	Specter	Metzenbaum	Garn	Rudman		
Glenn	Sasser	Stevens	Mitchell	Gorton	Simpson		
Heflin	Stennis	Symms	Nunn	Grassley	Stafford		
Huddleston	Zorinsky	Thurmond	Pell	Hatch	Tower		
Inouye		Trible	Tsongas	Hatfield	Wallop		
				Hecht	Warner		
				Heinz	Weicker		
				Humphrey	Wilson		
				Jepsen			

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

1—Official Business
2—Necessarily Absent
3—Illness
4—Other

SYMBOLS:

AY—Announced Yea
AN—Announced Nay
PY—Paired Yea
PN—Paired Nay

ANALYSIS OF ISSUE VOTED ON:

Party Cohesion	**Measure of Party Support on Issue as Voted on**	
	For (44)	*Against* (52)
Democrats— 66%	Democrats— 29 or 66%	Democrats— 15 or 29%
Republicans— 71%	Republicans— 15 or 34%	Republicans— 37 or 71%

Prepared and Compiled by Senate Democratic Policy Committee
Robert C. Byrd, Chairman

SENATE VOTING RECORD

NO. 51

98th Congress
1st Session

March 23, 1983, 6:48 p.m.
Temp. Cong. Rec. p. S-3742

SOCIAL SECURITY REFORM

BILL NO.: H.R. 1900 **AMENDMENT NO.:** UP 134

TITLE: "Social Security Amendments of 1983."

SUBJECT: **Quayle amendment allowing those collecting unemployment compensation the option of receiving up to 75 percent of their compensation in vouchers, to be given to a new employer upon being hired, who could apply the voucher against payments owed the government for income tax, FICA, etc.**

NOTE: Proponents contended that this experimental voucher program would allow unemployed workers who are eligible for Federal Supplemental Unemployment benefits to transform their unemployment benefits into a voucher that would increase their chances of getting a job. Specifically, the voucher, which would be equal to 75 percent of the benefits for which the worker was eligible, would act as a wage subsidy paid to employers that hire program participants. The voucher, which would be paid in quarterly installments, could be used to pay any of the employer's obligations to the Treasury such as employment withholding, FICA, or FUTA. This amendment would not require employers to make special claims on their tax returns and contains provisions that prohibit worker substitution.

Critics of this voucher proposal asserted that it would give program participants a considerable advantage in the job market over those who have exhausted their unemployment benefits. The effect would be to aid those who have been unemployed a shorter period of time at the expense of those who have been unemployed longer and experiencing greater financial difficulty. Such proposals would create no net jobs because the jobs taken by those with the vouchers would have been created regardless of government intervention, and the effect simply is that subsidized workers are hired for jobs that non-subsidized workers otherwise would have taken. This is not technically substitution (where an existing employee is released and a subsidized employee hired to take his place), but the practical effect is the same.

This amendment was omitted in the conference report.

H.R. 1900: Vote Nos. 28, 29, 31-43, 46-54.

RESULT: **AMENDMENT AGREED TO**

YEAS (53)

Democrats (1 or 2%)

Zorinsky

Republicans (52 or 100%)

Abdnor
Andrews
Armstrong
Baker
Boschwitz
Chafee
Cochran
Cohen
D'Amato
Danforth
Denton
Dole
Domenici
Durenberger
East
Garn
Gorton
Grassley
Hatch
Hatfield
Hawkins
Hecht
Heinz
Helms
Humphrey
Jepsen
Kassebaum
Kasten
Laxalt
Lugar
Mattingly
McClure
Murkowski
Nickles
Packwood
Percy
Pressler
Quayle
Roth
Rudman
Simpson
Specter
Stafford
Stevens
Symms
Thurmond
Tower
Trible
Wallop
Warner
Weicker
Wilson

NAYS (40)

Democrats (40 or 98%)

Baucus
Bentsen
Biden
Bingaman
Bradley
Bumpers
Burdick
Byrd
Chiles
DeConcini
Dixon
Dodd
Eagleton
Exon
Ford
Glenn
Hart
Heflin
Huddleston
Inouye
Jackson
Johnston
Kennedy
Lautenberg
Leahy
Levin
Long
Matsunaga
Metzenbaum
Mitchell
Moynihan
Nunn
Pell
Proxmire
Pryor
Randolph
Riegle
Sarbanes
Sasser
Tsongas

Republicans (0 or 0%)

NOT VOTING (6)

Democrats (4)

Cranston—2
Hollings—2
Melcher—2PN
Stennis—2

Republicans (2)

Goldwater—2
Mathias—2

LIVE PAIRS (1)

PRESENT AND GIVING: **RECEIVING:**

Boren (PY) .... Melcher (PN)

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

1—Official Business
2—Necessarily Absent
3—Illness
4—Other

SYMBOLS:

AY—Announced Yea
AN—Announced Nay
PY—Paired Yea
PN—Paired Nay

ANALYSIS OF ISSUE VOTED ON:

Party Cohesion	Measure of Party Support on Issue as Voted on *For* (53)	*Against* (40)
Democrats— 98%	Democrats— 1 or 2%	Democrats— 40 or 100%
Republicans— 100%	Republicans— 52 or 98%	Republicans— 0 or 0%

Prepared and Compiled by Senate Democratic Policy Committee
Robert C. Byrd, Chairman

SENATE VOTING RECORD

NO. 55

98th Congress
1st Session

April 14, 1983, 2:00 p.m.
Temp. Cong. Rec. p. S-4662

NOMINATION OF KENNETH L. ADELMAN

POSITION: Director of the United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency

SUBJECT: **Confirmation of the nomination of Kenneth L. Adelman, of Virginia, to be Director of the United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.**

NOTE: The Foreign Relations Committee held hearings on the nomination on January 27, and February 3 and 24. After a motion to favorably report the nomination failed by a vote of 8 to 9, the Committee reported the nomination with a recommendation that he not be confirmed by a vote of 14 to 3. Supporters of the nomination emphasized that the Senate customarily honors the President's right to appoint those he trusts to implement his policies. Adelman has served well as Deputy U.N. Representative and, as such, headed the U.S. delegation to the Committee on Disarmament, coordinated the U.S. delegation to the Second Special Session on Disarmament, and represented U.N. Ambassador Kirkpatrick in National Security Council meetings on START and INF. Although Ambassador Adelman's extensive writing includes articles critical of the SALT process and incremental approaches to arms control, they are supportive of arms control efforts. Those opposing the nomination are improperly making it a referendum on the President's arms control policy. Defeat of the nomination could delay the progress of current negotiations through which the Administration is moving with determination to establish a constructive and stabilizing arms control framework that will lead to real reductions in arms. Supporters discounted the nominee's controversial responses during the Auletta interview and noted that Adelman has specifically testified that he does not view arms control as a sham. Adelman has been endorsed by U.N. Ambassador Kirkpatrick, Dr. Eugene Rostow (the previous ACDA Director), President Ford, former Secretary of State Kissinger, and former Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld.

(OVER)

RESULT: **NOMINATION CONFIRMED** ADMINISTRATION POSITION: YEA

YEAS (57)			NAYS (42)			NOT VOTING (1)	
Democrats (8 or 17%)	**Republicans (49 or 92%)**		**Democrats (38 or 83%)**		**Republicans (4 or 8%)**	**Democrats (0)**	**Republicans (1)**
Dixon	Abdnor	Kassebaum	Baucus	Huddleston	Andrews		Packwood—2
Heflin	Armstrong	Kasten	Bentsen	Inouye	Gorton		
Jackson	Baker	Laxalt	Biden	Kennedy	Mathias		
Johnston	Boschwitz	Lugar	Bingaman	Lautenberg	Pressler		
Long	Chafee	Mattingly	Boren	Leahy			
Moynihan	Cochran	McClure	Bradley	Levin			
Randolph	Cohen	Murkowski	Bumpers	Matsunaga			
Zorinsky	D'Amato	Nickles	Burdick	Melcher			
	Danforth	Percy	Byrd	Metzenbaum			
	Denton	Quayle	Chiles	Mitchell			
	Dole	Roth	Cranston	Nunn			
	Domenici	Rudman	DeConcini	Pell			
	Durenberger	Simpson	Dodd	Proxmire			
	East	Specter	Eagleton	Pryor			
	Garn	Stafford	Exon	Riegle			
	Goldwater	Stevens	Ford	Sarbanes			
	Grassley	Symms	Glenn	Sasser			
	Hatch	Thurmond	Hart	Stennis			
	Hatfield	Tower	Hollings	Tsongas			
	Hawkins	Trible					
	Hecht	Wallop					
	Heinz	Warner					
	Helms	Weicker					
	Humphrey	Wilson					
	Jepsen						

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

1—Official Business
2—Necessarily Absent
3—Illness
4—Other

SYMBOLS:

AY—Announced Yea
AN—Announced Nay
PY—Paired Yea
PN—Paired Nay

ANALYSIS OF ISSUE VOTED ON:

Party Cohesion	Measure of Party Support on Issue as Voted on *For* (57)	*Against* (42)
Democrats— 83%	Democrats— 8 or 14%	Democrats— 38 or 90%
Republicans— 92%	Republicans— 49 or 86%	Republicans— 4 or 10%

Prepared and Compiled by Senate Democratic Policy Committee
Robert C. Byrd, Chairman

32-733 O - 84 - 5

Opponents pointed out that the Senate has only three times in this century ignored a Committee's recommendation that a nominee be rejected. The Committee report made it clear that Ambassador Adelman lacks the stature, qualifications, and commitment to arms control necessary to be head of the ACDA. Adelman lacks the experience to be "the principal adviser to the Secretary of State, the National Security Council, and the President on arms control and disarmament", which is the statutory definition of a Director of the ACDA. As ambassador to the U.N., Adelman's duties involved less the development of arms control policies than their explanation and defense; his prior government experience had no direct relation to arms control policy. A review of the 116 articles recommended by the nominee to the Committee reveals that most deal with southern Africa and that relatively few bear directly on arms control. Adelman's initial testimony demonstrated an unacceptable understanding of vital arms control issues. He expressed no opinion to questions of whether nuclear war could be limited, what the U.S. response would be if the Soviets offered to have a comprehensive and verifiable elimination of nuclear weaponry, if the Soviets are violating the unratified SALT II treaty, and if either side could prevail in a nuclear exchange. Attempts to clarify and remedy his responses in a subsequent hearing were generally inadequate. At his second hearing, Adelman's credibility was undermined by his evasive answers to queries about briefings received after his initial testimony which, by the nominee's own words, was too cautious. Later during the same hearing the nominee admitted that he had been grilled in two two-hour mock hearings or murder boards. A third hearing, convened to review Adelman's responses in an interview with Kenneth Auletta, further eroded the nominee's credibility when he denied any recollection of ever granting Auletta an interview even though phone records indicate the contrary. During the interview, Adelman characterized arms control as a "sham" and expressed support for negotiations solely for reasons of appearances and political advantage. Further he expressed reservations about initiating immediate arms control negotiations because ". . . in a democracy these negotiations tend to discourage money for defense programs." Some emphasized that this nomination must be given special scrutiny because the Administration's harsh rhetoric and emphasis on increased military spending has undermined our allies' support for U.S. initiatives on intermediate nuclear force negotiations. In order to restore the credibility of the Reagan Administration's commitment to arms control, the ACDA nominee must be of greater experience and stature. Adelman fails to measure up to former ACDA Directors such as William Foster, Gerald Smith, Fred Ikle, Paul Warnke, George Seignious, Ralph Earle, and Eugene Rostow or to the many individuals available who would make much more suitable candidates.

SENATE VOTING RECORD

NO. 57

98th Congress
1st Session

April 19, 1983, 7:16 p.m.
Temp. Cong. Rec. p. S-4843

INTEREST AND DIVIDEND WITHHOLDING REPEAL (CLOTURE)

BILL NO.: S. 144 **AMENDMENT NO.:** 522

TITLE: "International Trade and Investment Act."

SUBJECT: **Kasten, et al, motion to close further debate on the Kasten, et al, amendment repealing the withholding of tax on interest and dividends, which is scheduled to go into effect on July 1, 1983, and requiring taxpayers to file statements regarding interest, dividends, and patronage dividends.** (See also Vote Nos. 27, 37-39, and 58-62.)

The cloture petition, presented on April 15, 1983, was signed by Senators Kasten, Proxmire, Hawkins, Boren, East, Helms, Ford, Huddleston, Symms, Johnston, Hollings, Melcher, Kassebaum, Pryor, Hatch, Nickles, Exon, Denton, Randolph, Cochran, and Byrd.

NOTE: Proponents of the motion (and the original Kasten amendment) noted that the motion had been introduced and filed in a timely fashion and, thus, merits final disposition. They asserted that the Senate should record its position on interest and dividend withholding and questioned the undefined nature of the possible compromise, and the uncertain treatment it would receive by the House or the President.

Opponents of cloture at this point noted that invoking cloture would preclude modifying the Kasten amendment to conform it to a compromise that was being negotiated off the Senate floor. The compromise would provide standby withholding for those who fail to report their interest and dividend income and larger penalties for non-compliance, and delay mandatory withholding on interest and dividend income contingent upon verification by the General Accounting Office of achievement of a specified tax compliance goal. Defeat of the cloture petition would allow negotiations on a compromise to proceed. Should these negotiations fail, however, the position of supporters of repeal of interest and dividend withholding would be protected because a vote on a similar cloture petition is scheduled for April 20.

S. 144: Vote Nos. 56-63.

RESULT: **CLOTURE MOTION REJECTED, 3/5THS NOT HAVING VOTED IN THE AFFIRMATIVE**

YEAS (34)			NAYS (53)			NOT VOTING (13)	
Democrats (31 or 74%)		**Republicans (3 or 7%)**	**Democrats (11 or 26%)**	**Republicans (42 or 93%)**		**Democrats (4)**	**Republicans (9)**
Baucus	Johnston	East	Bingaman	Abdnor	Kassebaum	Biden—^{2}	Denton—^{2}
Bentsen	Leahy	Helms	Bradley	Andrews	Kasten	Hollings—^{2}	Durenberger—^{2}
Boren	Long	Humphrey	Bumpers	Armstrong	Lugar	Sasser—^{2}	Hatfield—^{2}
Burdick	Matsunaga		Cranston	Baker	Mattingly	Tsongas—^{2}	Laxalt—^{2}
Byrd	Melcher		Dodd	Boschwitz	McClure		Mathias—^{2}
Chiles	Mitchell		Hart	Chafee	Murkowski		Packwood—^{2}
DeConcini	Moynihan		Kennedy	Cochran	Nickles		Roth—^{2}
Dixon	Nunn		Lautenberg	Cohen	Percy		Simpson—^{2AN}
Eagleton	Pell		Levin	D'Amato	Pressler		Weicker—^{2}
Exon	Pryor		Metzenbaum	Danforth	Quayle		
Ford	Randolph		Proxmire	Dole	Rudman		
Glenn	Riegle			Domenici	Specter		
Heflin	Sarbanes			Garn	Stafford		
Huddleston	Stennis			Goldwater	Stevens		
Inouye	Zorinsky			Gorton	Symms		
Jackson				Grassley	Thurmond		
				Hatch	Tower		
				Hawkins	Trible		
				Hecht	Wallop		
				Heinz	Warner		
				Jepsen	Wilson		

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

1—Official Business
2—Necessarily Absent
3—Illness
4—Other

SYMBOLS:

AY—Announced Yea
AN—Announced Nay
PY—Paired Yea
PN—Paired Nay

ANALYSIS OF ISSUE VOTED ON:

Party Cohesion	**Measure of Party Support on Issue as Voted on**	
	For (34)	*Against* (53)
Democrats— 74%	Democrats— 31 or 91%	Democrats— 11 or 21%
Republicans— 93%	Republicans— 3 or 9%	Republicans— 42 or 79%

Prepared and Compiled by Senate Democratic Policy Committee
Robert C. Byrd, Chairman

SENATE VOTING RECORD

NO. 58

98th Congress
1st Session

April 20, 1983, 3:02 p.m.
Temp. Cong. Rec. p. S-4958

INTEREST AND DIVIDEND WITHHOLDING REPEAL (CLOTURE)

BILL NO.: S. 144 **AMENDMENT NO.:** 522

TITLE: "International Trade and Investment Act."

SUBJECT: **Second Kasten, et al, motion to close further debate on the Kasten, et al, amendment repealing the withholding of tax on interest and dividends, which is scheduled to go into effect on July 1, 1983, and requiring taxpayers to file statements regarding interest, dividends, and patronage dividends.** (See also Vote Nos. 27, 37-39, 57, and 59-62.)

The cloture petition, presented on April 18, 1983, was signed by Senators Kasten, Proxmire, Hawkins, Boren, East, Helms, Ford, Huddleston, Symms, Johnston, Hollings, Melcher, Kassebaum, Pryor, Hatch, Nickles, Exon, Denton, Randolph, and Cochran.

NOTE: Proponents of the motion (and the original Kasten amendment) asserted that the Senate should record its position on interest and dividend withholding in a forthright manner. The value of the so-called compromise is questionable because it is uncertain how the House or the President will treat it. Given these considerations, and the fact that this compromise would be appended to a Senate-originated revenue bill, it remains an open question whether or not repeal of withholding would be enacted before its July 1 effective date.

Opponents of the motion pointed out that adoption of cloture would preclude consideration of the Dole-Kasten compromise (Vote No. 62). Some supported the compromise as the best chance for those who support repeal of interest and dividend withholding before its July 1 effective date. Others supported the compromise in order to retain about 50 percent of the revenue that would be lost under the original Kasten amendment. Some opposed repealing or delaying withholding and argued that it is still the most efficient manner to collect the tax due on unearned income just as it has been for American wage-earners since the 1940's.

S. 144: Vote Nos. 56-63.

RESULT: CLOTURE MOTION REJECTED, 3/5THS NOT HAVING VOTED IN THE AFFIRMATIVE

YEAS (39)

Democrats (37 or 82%)

Baucus
Bentsen
Biden
Bingaman
Boren
Bradley
Bumpers
Burdick
Byrd
Chiles
DeConcini
Dixon
Eagleton
Exon
Ford
Glenn
Heflin
Hollings
Huddleston
Inouye
Jackson
Johnston
Leahy
Long
Matsunaga
Melcher
Mitchell
Nunn
Pell
Pryor
Randolph
Riegle
Sarbanes
Sasser
Stennis
Tsongas
Zorinsky

Republicans (2 or 4%)

East
Helms

NAYS (59)

Democrats (8 or 18%)

Cranston
Dodd
Kennedy
Lautenberg
Levin
Metzenbaum
Moynihan
Proxmire

Republicans (51 or 96%)

Abdnor
Andrews
Armstrong
Baker
Boschwitz
Chafee
Cochran
Cohen
D'Amato
Danforth
Denton
Dole
Domenici
Durenberger
Garn
Goldwater
Gorton
Grassley
Hatch
Hatfield
Hawkins
Hecht
Heinz
Humphrey
Jepsen
Kassebaum
Kasten
Laxalt
Lugar
Mathias
Mattingly
McClure
Murkowski
Nickles
Packwood
Percy
Pressler
Quayle
Roth
Rudman
Simpson
Specter
Stafford
Stevens
Symms
Thurmond
Tower
Trible
Wallop
Warner
Wilson

NOT VOTING (2)

Democrats (1)

Hart—2

Republicans (1)

Weicker—2

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

1—Official Business
2—Necessarily Absent
3—Illness
4—Other

SYMBOLS:

AY—Announced Yea
AN—Announced Nay
PY—Paired Yea
PN—Paired Nay

ANALYSIS OF ISSUE VOTED ON:

Party Cohesion

Democrats— 82%
Republicans— 96%

Measure of Party Support on Issue as Voted on

For (39)
Democrats— 37 or 95%
Republicans— 2 or 5%

Against (59)
Democrats— 8 or 14%
Republicans— 51 or 86%

Prepared and Compiled by Senate Democratic Policy Committee
Robert C. Byrd, Chairman

SENATE VOTING RECORD

NO. 59

98th Congress
1st Session

April 20, 1983, 4:59 p.m.
Temp. Cong. Rec. p. S-4982

INTEREST AND DIVIDEND WITHHOLDING REPEAL

BILL NO.: S. 144 **AMENDMENT NO.:** 1181

TITLE: "International Trade and Investment Act."

SUBJECT: **Dole motion to table the Melcher amendment (to the Baker motion—Vote No. 60) to waive Titles III and IV of the Budget Act (which prohibit consideration of provisions that reduce the established revenue level) to allow consideration of the Kasten-Dole compromise amendment (delaying withholding until July 1, 1987) on this bill and any other bill to be considered by the Senate in this session of Congress.** (See Vote Nos. 27, 37-39, 57, 58, and 60-62.)

NOTE: Proponents of the Melcher amendment (voting nay) argued that it would preclude the parliamentary maneuver by which the supporters of withholding on dividend and interest income had avoided a direct vote on the issue (see Vote No. 38). It is proper that the Senate debate a budget waiver as a mechanism for weighing the true cost of an amendment. In this particular case, however, the revenue loss will be the same whether considered on this bill, or as is likely, on another legislative vehicle if the majority is to prevail and withholding is repealed before its July 1 effective date. Therefore, the Senate should dispense with this question in order that it may squarely face this issue and work its will.

No statements were made in opposition. See Vote No. 27 for arguments for and against withholding.

S. 144: Vote Nos. 56-63.

RESULT: MOTION TO TABLE AGREED TO

YEAS (60)

Democrats (8 or 18%)

Cranston
Dodd
Eagleton
Huddleston
Kennedy
Lautenberg
Levin
Metzenbaum

Republicans (52 or 100%)

Abdnor
Andrews
Armstrong
Baker
Boschwitz
Chafee
Cochran
Cohen
D'Amato
Danforth
Dole
Domenici
Durenberger
East
Garn
Goldwater
Gorton
Grassley
Hatch
Hatfield
Hawkins
Hecht
Heinz
Helms
Humphrey
Jepsen
Kassebaum
Kasten
Laxalt
Lugar
Mathias
Mattingly
McClure
Murkowski
Nickles
Packwood
Percy
Pressler
Quayle
Roth
Rudman
Simpson
Specter
Stafford
Stevens
Symms
Thurmond
Tower
Trible
Wallop
Warner
Wilson

NAYS (37)

Democrats (37 or 82%)

Baucus
Bentsen
Biden
Bingaman
Boren
Bradley
Bumpers
Burdick
Byrd
Chiles
DeConcini
Dixon
Exon
Ford
Glenn
Heflin
Hollings
Inouye
Jackson
Johnston
Leahy
Long
Matsunaga
Melcher
Mitchell
Moynihan
Nunn
Pell
Proxmire
Pryor
Randolph
Riegle
Sarbanes
Sasser
Stennis
Tsongas
Zorinsky

Republicans (0 or 0%)

NOT VOTING (3)

Democrats (1)

Hart—2

Republicans (2)

Denton—2
Weicker—2

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

1—Official Business
2—Necessarily Absent
3—Illness
4—Other

SYMBOLS:

AY—Announced Yea
AN—Announced Nay
PY—Paired Yea
PN—Paired Nay

ANALYSIS OF ISSUE VOTED ON:

Party Cohesion

Democrats— 82%
Republicans— 100%

Measure of Party Support on Issue as Voted on

For (60)
Democrats— 8 or 13%
Republicans— 52 or 87%

Against (37)
Democrats— 37 or 100%
Republicans— 0 or 0%

Prepared and Compiled by Senate Democratic Policy Committee
Robert C. Byrd, Chairman

SENATE VOTING RECORD

NO. 61

98th Congress	April 21, 1983, 2:23 p.m.
1st Session	Temp. Cong. Rec. p. S-5060

INTEREST AND DIVIDEND WITHHOLDING REPEAL

BILL NO.: S. 144 **AMENDMENT NO.:** 1193

TITLE: "International Trade and Investment Act."

SUBJECT: **Kasten motion to table the Long perfecting amendment (to the Kasten amendment—Vote Nos. 59 and 60) repealing (in lieu of delaying until July 1, 1987) the 10 percent withholding of tax on interest and dividends scheduled to take effect on July 1, 1983.** (See Vote Nos. 27, 37-39, 57-60, and 62.)

NOTE: Proponents of the amendment (voting nay) argued that there have been no assurances that the House will act on the compromise which incorporates the delay, nor that the President will sign the bill. With these uncertainties in mind, Senators should have the opportunity to go on record on the issue of withholding.

Opponents of the amendment argued that this vote could prevent anything positive from coming out of the protracted battle over withholding. Straight repeal could be wrongly perceived as a vote to tolerate noncompliance, is not likely to be considered by the House, and would be vetoed if passed. In addition to repealing withholding, this amendment would nullify alternative measures to increase compliance, including backup withholding provisions, increased penalties for fraud and negligence, the requirement that 1099 forms, like W-2's, be attached to tax returns, improved reporting and matching by banks and the IRS, as well as increased resources for the IRS. It makes sense to argue that there are less drastic ways to improve compliance that should be tried before making the jump to withholding—but not that compliance does not need to be improved. The Treasury and IRS now believe that backup withholding is practicable and the Joint Committee on Taxation has indicated that the compromise's elements will, if given sufficient follow-through in the appropriations process, save a considerable portion of the $13.4 billion that would otherwise be lost by repealing withholding. Proponents also noted that the bankers association supports the compromise.

S. 144: Vote Nos. 56-63.

RESULT: MOTION TO TABLE AGREED TO

YEAS (55)			NAYS (40)			NOT VOTING (5)	
Democrats (8 or 18%)	**Republicans (47 or 92%)**		**Democrats (36 or 82%)**		**Republicans (4 or 8%)**	**Democrats (2)**	**Republicans (3)**
Chiles	Abdnor	Kasten	Baucus	Jackson	Andrews	Glenn—2	Baker—2
Cranston	Armstrong	Laxalt	Bentsen	Johnston	East	Hart—2	Symms—2
Dodd	Boschwitz	Lugar	Biden	Leahy	Helms		Weicker—2
Kennedy	Chafee	Mathias	Bingaman	Long	Nickles		
Lautenberg	Cochran	Mattingly	Boren	Matsunaga			
Levin	Cohen	McClure	Bradley	Melcher			
Metzenbaum	D'Amato	Murkowski	Bumpers	Mitchell			
Proxmire	Danforth	Packwood	Burdick	Moynihan			
	Denton	Percy	Byrd	Nunn			
	Dole	Pressler	DeConcini	Pell			
	Domenici	Quayle	Dixon	Pryor			
	Durenberger	Roth	Eagleton	Randolph			
	Garn	Rudman	Exon	Riegle			
	Goldwater	Simpson	Ford	Sarbanes			
	Gorton	Specter	Heflin	Sasser			
	Grassley	Stafford	Hollings	Stennis			
	Hatch	Stevens	Huddleston	Tsongas			
	Hatfield	Thurmond	Inouye	Zorinsky			
	Hawkins	Tower					
	Hecht	Trible					
	Heinz	Wallop					
	Humphrey	Warner					
	Jepsen	Wilson					
	Kassebaum						

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

1—Official Business
2—Necessarily Absent
3—Illness
4—Other

SYMBOLS:

AY—Announced Yea
AN—Announced Nay
PY—Paired Yea
PN—Paired Nay

ANALYSIS OF ISSUE VOTED ON:

Party Cohesion	**Measure of Party Support on Issue as Voted on**	
	For (55)	*Against* (40)
Democrats— 82%	Democrats— 8 or 15%	Democrats— 36 or 90%
Republicans— 92%	Republicans— 47 or 85%	Republicans— 4 or 10%

Prepared and Compiled by Senate Democratic Policy Committee
Robert C. Byrd, Chairman

SENATE VOTING RECORD

NO. 64

98th Congress
1st Session

April 28, 1983, 2:53 p.m.
Temp. Cong. Rec. p. S-5547

IMMIGRATION REFORM

BILL NO.: S. 529

AMENDMENT NO.: 1215

TITLE: "Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1983."

SUBJECT: **Kennedy amendment sunsetting the bill's employer sanctions provisions if the Comptroller General, in the last report he must file with the Congress (six years following enactment), finds that these provisions have resulted in a widespread pattern of discrimination against U.S. citizens or eligible workers, and if both Houses pass a concurrent resolution confirming such findings within 30 days.** (See Vote No. 321, 97th-2d.)

NOTE: Proponents expressed concern that the employee sanctions provisions would contribute to discrimination whereby an employer would not hire someone for fear of prosecution because the prospective employee was of non-white/non-Anglo-Saxon background and lacked adequate identification. Clearly the elimination of patterns of discrimination in any form is basic and fundamental to this society. However, history shows that discriminatory laws, such as the blatantly anti-Asian language in the immigration law that existed during the 50 years prior to 1965, are difficult to repeal. This amendment would insure that if a pattern of discrimination is found Congress will have an opportunity to expeditiously vote on the issue.

Opponents asserted that this amendment would unwisely sunset employee sanctions, which are the keystone of immigration reform, only 2 years after the program has been fully implemented (allowing three years for implementation of a "more secure worker authorization system"). While there will always be those who will choose to discriminate regardless of the law, this bill provides significant anti-discrimination protections. Specifically, the bill requires independent review and reports to Congress by the GAO and the President on employer sanctions. Thus, should any new discrimination result Congress may take appropriate action.

S. 529: Vote Nos. 64, 65, 89-101.

RESULT: AMENDMENT REJECTED

YEAS (40)

Democrats
(27 or 68%)

Bentsen
Bingaman
Boren
Bradley
Chiles
Cranston
DeConcini
Dixon
Eagleton
Exon
Glenn
Heflin
Inouye
Jackson

Kennedy
Leahy
Levin
Matsunaga
Melcher
Metzenbaum
Mitchell
Moynihan
Nunn
Pell
Riegle
Sarbanes
Tsongas

Republicans
(13 or 25%)

Boschwitz
Chafee
D'Amato
Domenici
Hatch
Heinz
Jepsen
Packwood
Specter
Symms
Tower
Weicker
Wilson

NAYS (51)

Democrats
(13 or 32%)

Baucus
Bumpers
Byrd
Ford
Huddleston
Lautenberg
Long
Proxmire
Pryor
Randolph
Sasser
Stennis
Zorinsky

Republicans
(38 or 75%)

Abdnor
Andrews
Armstrong
Baker
Cochran
Cohen
Danforth
Denton
Dole
Durenberger
East
Garn
Goldwater
Gorton
Grassley
Hawkins
Hecht
Helms
Humphrey

Kassebaum
Kasten
Laxalt
Lugar
Mathias
Mattingly
Murkowski
Nickles
Percy
Pressler
Quayle
Roth
Rudman
Simpson
Stevens
Thurmond
Trible
Wallop
Warner

NOT VOTING (9)

Democrats (6)

Biden—^{2}
Burdick—^{1}
Dodd—^{2}
Hart—^{2}
Hollings—^{2}
Johnston—^{2}

Republicans (3)

Hatfield—^{2AN}
McClure—^{2}
Stafford—^{2}

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

1—Official Business
2—Necessarily Absent
3—Illness
4—Other

SYMBOLS:

AY—Announced Yea
AN—Announced Nay
PY—Paired Yea
PN—Paired Nay

ANALYSIS OF ISSUE VOTED ON:

Party Cohesion

Democrats— 68%
Republicans— 75%

Measure of Party Support on Issue as Voted on

For (40)
Democrats— 27 or 68%
Republicans— 13 or 32%

Against (51)
Democrats— 13 or 25%
Republicans— 38 or 75%

Prepared and Compiled by Senate Democratic Policy Committee
Robert C. Byrd, Chairman

SENATE VOTING RECORD

NO. 70

98th Congress
1st Session

May 4, 1983. 6:54 p.m.
Temp. Cong. Rec. p. S-5979

FIRST BUDGET RESOLUTION, 1984

BILL NO.: S. Con. Res. 27 (H. Con. Res. 91) **AMENDMENT NO.:** 1231

SUBJECT: **Baucus, et al, amendment increasing the funding level for medical insurance in order to partially restore Medicare cuts made by the Committee as follows: $15 million in FY 1983, $440 million in 1984, $593 million in 1985, and $748 million in 1986.**

NOTE: Proponents asserted that freezing physicians' fees, which is assumed under this budget, would merely shift a greater burden of increased health care costs to elderly Medicare recipients because only half of doctors agree to accept patients on assignment. Under assignment, Medicare pays the physician for 80 percent of his fee while the patient pays 20 percent. When a physician refuses assignment, Medicare makes a payment directly to the beneficiary for the physician fee, leaving the patient to pay the excess. Since only half of physicians participate in Medicare, freezing physicians' fees would only cap the payment made by Medicare to beneficiaries. In the last three years, Congress has enacted $28 billion in cuts in Medicare but major reforms are still needed to prevent the system's bankruptcy by 1987. The spiraling cost of health care, which has increased three times the average of inflation for the last ten years, is the major problem facing Medicare. Shifting costs to beneficiaries does little to control costs because 70 percent of health care decisions are made by doctors, not patients. Congress should not try to achieve savings by shifting costs to the elderly but should attack the heart of the problem with a comprehensive and fair system to control health care costs.

Opponents contended that spiraling health care costs are caused by an insurance system that has insulated all participants from inflation. For example, the Part B Medicare deductible, the portion of physicians' charges paid by beneficiaries, has increased only 50 percent since 1967 while health costs of the Part B program have soared by 1,800 percent over the same period. GAO has found that 30 percent of home health services are misutilized. Therefore, it would be prudent to adjust fees in order to slow the growth in the Medicare program. Furthermore, Congress should consider applying a means test to Medicare beneficiaries which is similar in concept, they asserted, to the taxation of social security benefits enacted this year.

S. Con. Res. 27 (H. Con. Res. 91): Vote Nos. 66-86, 102-112, 171, 172.

RESULT: AMENDMENT REJECTED

YEAS (45)			NAYS (50)			NOT VOTING (5)	
Democrats (40 or 93%)		**Republicans (5 or 10%)**	**Democrats (3 or 7%)**	**Republicans (47 or 90%)**		**Democrats (3)**	**Republicans (2)**
Baucus	Inouye	D'Amato	Boren	Abdnor	Kassebaum	Bentsen—2	Goldwater—2
Biden	Jackson	Hawkins	Nunn	Andrews	Kasten	Sasser—2	Percy—2
Bingaman	Johnston	Packwood	Proxmire	Armstrong	Laxalt	Tsongas—2	
Bradley	Kennedy	Pressler		Baker	Lugar		
Bumpers	Lautenberg	Specter		Boschwitz	Mathias		
Burdick	Leahy			Chafee	Mattingly		
Byrd	Levin			Cochran	McClure		
Chiles	Long			Cohen	Murkowski		
Cranston	Matsunaga			Danforth	Nickles		
DeConcini	Melcher			Denton	Quayle		
Dixon	Metzenbaum			Dole	Roth		
Dodd	Mitchell			Domenici	Rudman		
Eagleton •	Moynihan			Durenberger	Simpson		
Exon	Pell			East	Stafford		
Ford	Pryor			Garn	Stevens		
Glenn	Randolph			Gorton	Symms		
Hart	Riegle			Grassley	Thurmond		
Heflin	Sarbanes			Hatch	Tower		
Hollings	Stennis			Hatfield	Trible		
Huddleston	Zorinsky			Hecht	Wallop		
				Heinz	Warner		
				Helms	Weicker		
				Humphrey	Wilson		
				Jepsen			

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

1—Official Business
2—Necessarily Absent
3—Illness
4—Other

SYMBOLS:

AY—Announced Yea
AN—Announced Nay
PY—Paired Yea
PN—Paired Nay

ANALYSIS OF ISSUE VOTED ON:

Party Cohesion	Measure of Party Support on Issue as Voted on: *For* (45)	*Against* (50)
Democrats— 93%	Democrats— 40 or 89%	Democrats— 3 or 6%
Republicans— 90%	Republicans— 5 or 11%	Republicans— 47 or 94%

Prepared and Compiled by Senate Democratic Policy Committee
Robert C. Byrd, Chairman

Function 570: Medical Insurance—**Effect of Amendment.** (A dash indicates that the figure would not be changed.)

	1983		1984		1985		1986	
	BA	O	BA	O	BA	O	BA	O
			(in billions)					
Committee Resolution	$46.100	$53.100	$61.400	$60.300	$69.400	$68.300	$79.100	$75.600
Baucus amendment	--	+0.015	+0.430	+0.440	+0.583	+0.593	+0.735	+0.748

SENATE VOTING RECORD

NO. 71

98th Congress
1st Session

May 5, 1983, 11:51 a.m.
Temp. Cong. Rec. p. S-6075

FIRST BUDGET RESOLUTION, 1984

BILL NO.: S. Con. Res. 27 (H. Con. Res. 91) AMENDMENT NO.: 1234

SUBJECT: **Domenici motion to table the Metzenbaum amendment increasing the funding level for income security by a total of $3.75 million in budget authority and $8.68 billion in outlays for FY 1983-86 in order to maintain extended unemployment benefits for 23 States and to instruct the Finance Committee to report legislation to suspend the 1981 Reconciliation Act change in the eligibility formula for the Federal-State extended benefit program.** The 23 States and their unemployment rates are: Alabama-16.1%, Alaska-12.5%, California-11.9%, Idaho-13%, Illinois-13.8%, Indiana-13.2%, Iowa-10.8%, Louisiana-11.6%, Maine-10.9%, Minnesota-10.3%, Mississippi-12.4%, Montana-10.6%, North Carolina-10.2%, North Dakota-8.9%, Ohio-14.5%, Oregon-13.1%, Rhode Island-12.1%, Utah-9.9%, Vermont-8.1%, Virgin Islands-rate unavailable, Washington-12.8%, Wisconsin-12.7%, and Wyoming-10.9%. (See also Vote Nos. 291, 366, and 367, 97th-2d.)

NOTE: Proponents of the amendment contended that changes in the 1981 Reconciliation Act would trigger-off 23 States from the Federal-State unemployment program in spite of continued high unemployment rates. Under the 1981 Reconciliation Act, recipients of Federal-State extended unemployment benefits are not counted in the insured unemployment rate (IUR) which is used to determine a State's eligibility for Federal-State extended unemployment benefits. The amendment would also suspend the requirement that a State's IUR be 120 percent of the rate of the two previous years. The 1981 Reconciliation Act was enacted when the Reagan program projected unemployment to fall from 7.2 to 6.9 percent and predicted real economic growth of 7.2 percent in FY 1982 and 6.6

(OVER)

S. Con. Res. 27 (H. Con. Res. 91): Vote Nos. 66-86, 102-112, 171, 172.

RESULT: MOTION TO TABLE AGREED TO

YEAS (63)			NAYS (34)			NOT VOTING (3)	
Democrats (11 or 25%)	**Republicans (52 or 98%)**		**Democrats (33 or 75%)**		**Republicans (1 or 2%)**	**Democrats (2)**	**Republicans (1)**
Baucus	Abdnor	Kassebaum	Biden	Lautenberg	Mathias	Dodd—^{2}	Denton—^{2AY}
Bentsen	Andrews	Kasten	Bradley	Leahy		Matsunaga—^{2}	
Bingaman	Armstrong	Laxalt	Bumpers	Levin			
Boren	Baker	Lugar	Burdick	Melcher			
Chiles	Boschwitz	Mattingly	Byrd	Metzenbaum			
DeConcini	Chafee	McClure	Cranston	Mitchell			
Exon	Cochran	Murkowski	Dixon	Moynihan			
Johnston	Cohen	Nickles	Eagleton	Pell			
Long	D'Amato	Packwood	Ford	Proxmire			
Nunn	Danforth	Percy	Glenn	Pryor			
Zorinsky	Dole	Pressler	Hart	Randolph			
	Domenici	Quayle	Heflin	Riegle			
	Durenberger	Roth	Hollings	Sarbanes			
	East	Rudman	Huddleston	Sasser			
	Garn	Simpson	Inouye	Stennis			
	Goldwater	Specter	Jackson	Tsongas			
	Gorton	Stafford	Kennedy				
	Grassley	Stevens					
	Hatch	Symms					
	Hatfield	Thurmond					
	Hawkins	Tower					
	Hecht	Trible					
	Heinz	Wallop					
	Helms	Warner					
	Humphrey	Weicker					
	Jepsen	Wilson					

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

1—Official Business
2—Necessarily Absent
3—Illness
4—Other

SYMBOLS:

AY—Announced Yea
AN—Announced Nay
PY—Paired Yea
PN—Paired Nay

ANALYSIS OF ISSUE VOTED ON:

Party Cohesion	**Measure of Party Support on Issue as Voted on**	
	For (63)	*Against* (34)
Democrats— 75%	Democrats— 11 or 17%	Democrats— 33 or 97%
Republicans— 98%!	Republicans— 52 or 83%	Republicans— 1 or 3%

Prepared and Compiled by Senate Democratic Policy Committee
Robert C. Byrd, Chairman

percent in 1983. Instead, unemployment soared to post-World War II highs and economic "growth" for 1982 was a minus 1.3 percent and is proceeding in 1983 at a meager percentage. As a result, the minimum number of weeks a jobless worker may receive benefits in these States is as little as 34. When the Federal supplemental benefit program expires on October 1, 1983, the maximum number of weeks will fall to 26 in all but three States and Puerto Rico—even though this budget assumes that unemployment will hover around ten percent at the beginning of 1984. Unemployment benefits should not be curtailed while the economy remains so weak and unemployment unacceptably high.

Opponents asserted that this amendment would increase the deficit by $7.6 billion over the next three years. Because the Federal-State extended unemployment benefit program is funded by equal contributions from Federal and individual State funds, the amendment would aggravate the fiscal problems of a number of States that have been hard hit by unemployment. The amendment would only affect 11 States of which several already have outstanding loans for their unemployment trust funds. Congress has addressed the needs of the unemployed by repeatedly authorizing Federally-funded supplemental benefits and providing funds for job training.

Function 600: Income Security—**Effect of Amendment**.

	1983		1984		1985		1986	
	BA	O	BA	O	BA	O	BA	O
			(in billions)					
Committee resolution	$121.70	$110.20	$126.00	$104.10	$127.50	$105.50	$131.40	$108.60
Metzenbaum amendment	+0.45	+0.97	+0.90	+1.95	+1.30	+2.90	+1.10	+2.86

SENATE VOTING RECORD

NO. 72

98th Congress
1st Session

May 5, 1983, 2:06 p.m.
Temp. Cong. Rec. p. S-6093

FIRST BUDGET RESOLUTION, 1984

BILL NO.: S. Con. Res. 27 (H. Con. Res. 91) **AMENDMENT NO.:** 1236

SUBJECT: **Kennedy-Riegle amendment (as a substitute for the Dole, et al, modified amendment—Vote No. 73) increasing the funding level for health by adding $900 million in FY 1983 and $2.7 billion in FY 1984-85 for health insurance for the unemployed—the amount passed by the House.**

NOTE: Proponents of the amendment noted that the Congressional Budget Office has estimated that over ten million unemployed Americans and their dependents have lost their health benefits due to the loss of their jobs—one of the worst consequences of this recession. The unemployed cannot apply for Medicaid because they do not qualify for SSI—which focuses on the aged, blind, or disabled—or AFDC—which targets families deprived of support by a main wage earner. Should Congress fail to act, the cost will be much greater in terms of higher infant mortality and deterioration of the health of the work force than the program now proposed. CBO has projected that it would require about $6 billion to provide health care insurance for all unemployed workers and their families. In view of the magnitude of this problem, this proposal is eminently modest. To adopt a program without significant funds, however, would falsely raise the hopes of the unemployed that Congress has addressed this pressing need.

Opponents of the amendment emphasized that Congress should adopt a temporary, limited program to aid the approximate 5.3 million persons who are entitled to but do not have private insurance or are not eligible for Medicare or Medicaid. The principle need for this legislation stems from the overwhelming demand placed on local and charitable providers of health to meet the needs of the unemployed. The House has already decided to spend $2.7 billion per year on an entitlement program to provide health benefits for the unemployed. Since history has shown that initial cost estimates tend to understate a

(OVER)

S. Con. Res. 27 (H. Con. Res. 91): Vote Nos. 66-86, 102-112, 171, 172.

RESULT: AMENDMENT REJECTED

YEAS (36)

Democrats (35 or 78%)

Baucus
Bentsen
Biden
Bingaman
Boren
Bradley
Bumpers
Burdick
Byrd
Cranston
Dixon
Eagleton
Ford
Glenn
Hart
Heflin
Hollings
Huddleston
Inouye
Jackson
Kennedy
Lautenberg
Leahy
Levin
Matsunaga
Melcher
Metzenbaum
Mitchell
Moynihan
Pell
Randolph
Riegle
Sarbanes
Sasser
Tsongas

Republicans (1 or 2%)

Specter

NAYS (63)

Democrats (10 or 22%)

Chiles
DeConcini
Exon
Johnston
Long
Nunn
Proxmire
Pryor
Stennis
Zorinsky

Republicans (53 or 98%)

Abdnor
Andrews
Armstrong
Baker
Boschwitz
Chafee
Cochran
Cohen
D'Amato
Danforth
Denton
Dole
Domenici
Durenberger
East
Garn
Goldwater
Gorton
Grassley
Hatch
Hatfield
Hawkins
Hecht
Heinz
Helms
Humphrey
Jepsen
Kassebaum
Kasten
Laxalt
Lugar
Mathias
Mattingly
McClure
Murkowski
Nickles
Packwood
Percy
Pressler
Quayle
Roth
Rudman
Simpson
Stafford
Stevens
Symms
Thurmond
Tower
Trible
Wallop
Warner
Weicker
Wilson

NOT VOTING (1)

Democrats (1) **Republicans (0)**

Dodd—2

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

1—Official Business
2—Necessarily Absent
3—Illness
4—Other

SYMBOLS:

AY—Announced Yea
AN—Announced Nay
PY—Paired Yea
PN—Paired Nay

ANALYSIS OF ISSUE VOTED ON:

Party Cohesion

Democrats— 78%
Republicans— 98%

Measure of Party Support on Issue as Voted on

For (36)
Democrats— 35 or 97%
Republicans— 1 or 3%

Against (63)
Democrats— 10 or 16%
Republicans— 53 or 84%

Prepared and Compiled by Senate Democratic Policy Committee
Robert C. Byrd, Chairman

new program's cost, the Senate should adopt a conservative figure in anticipation of a compromise in a conference with the other body. Furthermore, in order to avoid increasing the deficit, the Senate should ensure that revenue measures are enacted to cover the program's cost as provided in the Dole amendment—Vote No. 73. Some opposed any effort to provide health insurance for the unemployed, characterizing it as an example of another uncontrollable outlay that will further increase the public debt. Current Federal income support programs and Medicare should adequately complement private and local charitable efforts, which are more effective providers of health care to the unemployed. Morever, Congress should be careful not to remove incentives for the unemployed to rejoin the work force.

Health Function 550: Health—**Effect of Amendment.**

	1983		1984		1985	
	BA	O	BA	O	BA	O
	(in billions)					
Committee resolution	$25.100	$29.600	$31.800	$31.800	$35.000	$34.500
Kennedy substitute	+0.900	+0.900	+2.700	+2.700	+2.700	+2.700
Dole amendment	+0.225	+0.225	+0.900	+0.900	+0.675	+0.675

SENATE VOTING RECORD

NO. 74

98th Congress
1st Session

May 5, 1983, 6:00 p.m.
Temp. Cong. Rec. p. S-6138

FIRST BUDGET RESOLUTION, 1984

BILL NO.: S. Con. Res. 27 (H. Con. Res. 91) **AMENDMENT NO.:** 1238

SUBJECT: **Rudman amendment increasing the funding level for education by $400 million in each of FY 1984-86.** (See also Vote Nos. 75-78.)

NOTE: Proponents argued that the amendment, which had been intended as a substitute for the Hollings amendment (Vote No. 76), would provide more reasonable increases in light of the current economic situation and in comparison to growth of other Federal programs. It would, however, provide for funding levels similar to the Hollings amendment for an important new math and science program. The problems plaguing education are of a general nature and cannot be solved by money alone. Funds spent on education will not necessarily translate into higher teachers pay or improved performance in reading, writing, and mathematics.

Opponents noted that educators and financial experts agree that the American educational system must be modernized to meet the challenges of changing technologies and improved foreign competition. The report of the National Commission on Excellence in Education, A Nation at Risk, warns that "our very future as a nation and as a people" is threatened because of the steady decline in education achievement. A Wall Street-funded study found that "much of the Japanese success in the workplace appears attributable to . . . the effectiveness of Japanese primary and secondary education." Given this consensus, the Rudman amendment's increases are too modest in light of the erosion of education funding under the Reagan Administration. For example, the $14.9 billion level for FY 1984 proposed by the Senate Budget Committee remains $7.2 billion less than the funds required to restore education funding to its 1980 level when adjusted for inflation. While immediate restoration is impossible given the size of the Federal deficit, increases of the magnitude provided by the Hollings amendment would provide a meaningful step toward this goal. Those concerned about increased deficits should note that

(OVER)

S. Con. Res. 27 (H. Con. Res. 91): Vote Nos. 66-86, 102-112, 171, 172.

RESULT: AMENDMENT AGREED TO

YEAS (50)

Democrats (2 or 5%)

Jackson
Zorinsky

Republicans (48 or 91%)

Abdnor
Armstrong
Baker
Boschwitz
Chafee
Danforth
Denton
Dole
Domenici
Durenberger
East
Garn
Goldwater
Gorton
Grassley
Hatch
Hatfield
Hawkins
Hecht
Heinz
Helms
Humphrey
Jepsen
Kassebaum
Laxalt
Lugar
Mathias
Mattingly
McClure
Murkowski
Nickles
Packwood
Percy
Pressler
Quayle
Roth
Rudman
Simpson
Specter
Stevens
Symms
Thurmond
Tower
Trible
Wallop
Warner
Weicker
Wilson

NAYS (46)

Democrats (41 or 95%)

Baucus
Biden
Bingaman
Boren
Bradley
Bumpers
Burdick
Byrd
Chiles
Cranston
DeConcini
Dixon
Eagleton
Exon
Ford
Glenn
Hart
Heflin
Hollings
Huddleston
Inouye
Johnston
Lautenberg
Leahy
Levin
Long
Matsunaga
Melcher
Metzenbaum
Mitchell
Moynihan
Nunn
Pell
Proxmire
Pryor
Randolph
Riegle
Sarbanes
Sasser
Stennis
Tsongas

Republicans (5 or 9%)

Andrews
Cochran
Cohen
D'Amato
Stafford

NOT VOTING (4)

Democrats (3)

Bentsen—2
Dodd—2
Kennedy—2AN

Republicans (1)

Kasten—2

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

1—Official Business
2—Necessarily Absent
3—Illness
4—Other

SYMBOLS:

AY—Announced Yea
AN—Announced Nay
PY—Paired Yea
PN—Paired Nay

ANALYSIS OF ISSUE VOTED ON:

Party Cohesion

Democrats— 95%
Republicans— 91%

Measure of Party Support on Issue as Voted on

For (50)
Democrats— 2 or 4%
Republicans— 48 or 96%

Against (46)
Democrats— 41 or 89%
Republicans— 5 or 11%

Prepared and Compiled by Senate Democratic Policy Committee
Robert C. Byrd, Chairman

this Administration has added $101 billion to the national deficit for defense spending but has cut education funding to the detriment of America's economic and national security. Adoption of the Rudman amendment would mean less funds for compensatory education of disadvantaged children and student financial assistance and, therefore, fewer opportunities for American youth to improve themselves in order to meet the challenges of tomorrow.

Function 500: Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services—**Effect of Amendment.**

	1984		1985		1986	
	BA	O	BA	O	BA	O
	(in billions)					
Committee reported resolution	$30.800	$27.000	$27.500	$27.400	$27.500	$27.400
Rudman amendment	+ 0.400	+ 0.200	+ 0.400	+0.400	+ 0.400	+ 0.400

SENATE VOTING RECORD

NO. 75

98th Congress
1st Session

May 5, 1983, 6:27 p.m.
Temp. Cong. Rec. p. S-6139

FIRST BUDGET RESOLUTION, 1984

BILL NO.: S. Con. Res. 27 (H. Con. Res. 91) AMENDMENT NO.: 1237

SUBJECT: **Domenici motion to table the Hollings-Stafford, et al, amendment increasing the funding level for education by $1.5 billion in budget authority in FY 1984, $1.79 billion in 1985, and $1.89 billion in 1986 above the levels approved by the Budget Committee.** (See also Vote Nos. 74 and 76-78.)

NOTE: Proponents of the amendment noted that educators and financial experts agree that the American educational system must be modernized to meet the challenges of changing technologies and improved foreign competition. The report of the National Commission on Excellence in Education, A Nation at Risk, warns that "our very future as a nation and as a people" is threatened because of the steady decline in educational achievement. A Wall Street-funded study found that "much of the Japanese success in the workplace appears attributable to . . . the effectiveness of Japanese primary and secondary education." Given this consensus and the steady erosion of education funding under the Reagan Administration, the Rudman amendment's increases are too modest. The $14.9 billion level for FY 1984 proposed by the Senate Budget Committee remains $7.2 billion less than the funds required to restore education funding to its 1980 level when adjusted for inflation. While immediate restoration is impossible given the size of the Federal deficit, increases of the magnitude provided by the Hollings amendment would provide a meaningful step towards this goal. Those concerned about increased deficits should note that this Administration has added $101 billion to the national deficit for defense spending but has cut education funding to the detriment of America's economic and national security. Adherence to the levels provided by the Rudman amendment (Vote No. 74), would mean less funds for compensatory education of disadvantaged children and student financial assistance and, therefore, fewer opportunities for American youth to improve themselves in order to meet the challenges of tomorrow.

(OVER)

S. Con. Res. 27 (H. Con. Res. 91): Vote Nos. 66-86, 102-112, 171, 172.

RESULT: MOTION TO TABLE DEFEATED

YEAS (46)			NAYS (48)			NOT VOTING (6)	
Democrats (1 or 2%)	**Republicans (45 or 88%)**		**Democrats (42 or 98%)**		**Republicans (6 or 12%)**	**Democrats (3)**	**Republicans (3)**
Proxmire	Abdnor	Laxalt	Baucus	Jackson	Andrews	Bentsen—2	D'Amato—2
	Armstrong	Lugar	Biden	Johnston	Cochran	Dodd—2AN	Kasten—2
	Baker	Mathias	Bingaman	Lautenberg	Cohen	Kennedy—2AN	Tower—2
	Boschwitz	Mattingly	Boren	Leahy	Jepsen		
	Chafee	McClure	Bradley	Levin	Specter		
	Danforth	Murkowski	Bumpers	Long	Stafford		
	Denton	Nickles	Burdick	Matsunaga			
	Dole	Packwood	Byrd	Melcher			
	Domenici	Percy	Chiles	Metzenbaum			
	Durenberger	Pressler	Cranston	Mitchell			
	East	Quayle	DeConcini	Moynihan			
	Garn	Roth	Dixon	Nunn			
	Goldwater	Rudman	Eagleton	Pell			
	Gorton	Simpson	Exon	Pryor			
	Grassley	Stevens	Ford	Randolph			
	Hatch	Symms	Glenn	Riegle			
	Hatfield	Thurmond	Hart	Sarbanes			
	Hawkins	Trible	Heflin	Sasser			
	Hecht	Wallop	Hollings	Stennis			
	Heinz	Warner	Huddleston	Tsongas			
	Helms	Weicker	Inouye	Zorinsky			
	Humphrey	Wilson					
	Kassebaum						

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:
1—Official Business
2—Necessarily Absent
3—Illness
4—Other

SYMBOLS:
AY—Announced Yea
AN—Announced Nay
PY—Paired Yea
PN—Paired Nay

ANALYSIS OF ISSUE VOTED ON:

Party Cohesion	**Measure of Party Support on Issue as Voted on**	
	For (46)	*Against* (48)
Democrats— 98%	Democrats— 1 or 2%	Democrats— 42 or 88%
Republicans— 88%	Republicans— 45 or 98%	Republicans— 6 or 12%

Prepared and Compiled by Senate Democratic Policy Committee
Robert C. Byrd. Chairman

Opponents emphasized that the Senate cannot ignore the effect of the increases proposed by the Hollings amendment on the national debt. The Rudman amendment, which had been intended as a substitute for the Hollings amendment (Vote No. 76), would provide more reasonable increases in light of the current economic situation and in comparison to growth of other Federal programs. It would, however, provide for funding levels similar to the Hollings amendment for an important new math and science program. The problems plaguing education are of a general nature and cannot be solved by money alone. Funds spent on education will not necessarily translate into higher teachers' pay or improved performance in reading, writing, and mathematics.

Function 500: Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services—**Effect of Amendment.**

	1984		1985		1986	
	BA	O	BA	O	BA	O
			(in billions)			
Committee reported resolution	$30.800	$27.000	$27.500	$27.400	$27.500	$27.400
Rudman amendment	+ 0.400	+ 0.200	+ 0.400	+0.400	+ 0.400	+ 0.400
TOTAL	$31.200	$27.200	$27.900	$27.800	$27.900	$27.800

****

	1984		1985		1986	
	BA	O	BA	O	BA	O
Committee reported resolution	$30.800	$27.000	$27.500	$27.400	$27.500	$27.400
Hollings amendment #1237	+$1.500	+$0.255	+$1.791	+$1.558	+$1.887	+$1.797
TOTAL	$32.300	$27.255	$29.291	$28.958	$29.387	$29.197

SENATE VOTING RECORD

NO. 76

98th Congress
1st Session

May 6. 1983. 10:27 a.m.
Temp. Cong. Rec. p. S-6213

FIRST BUDGET RESOLUTION, 1984

BILL NO.: S. Con. Res. 27 (H. Con. Res. 91) **AMENDMENT NO.:** 1237

SUBJECT: **Hollings motion to reconsider Vote No. 75 by which the Senate failed to table the Hollings-Stafford, et al, amendment increasing the funding level for education by $1.5 billion in budget authority in FY 1984, $1.79 billion in 1985, and $1.89 billion in 1986 above the levels approved by the Budget Committee.** (See also Vote Nos. 74 and 76-78.)

NOTE: Proponents of the amendment noted that educators and financial experts agree that the American educational system must be modernized to meet the challenges of changing technologies and improved foreign competition. The report of the National Commission on Excellence in Education, A Nation at Risk, warns that "our very future as a nation and as a people" is threatened because of the steady decline in educational achievement. A Wall Street-funded study found that "much of the Japanese success in the workplace appears attributable to . . . the effectiveness of Japanese primary and secondary education." Given this consensus and the steady erosion of education funding under the Reagan Administration, the Rudman amendment's increases are too modest. The $14.9 billion level for FY 1984 proposed by the Senate Budget Committee remains $7.2 billion less than the funds required to restore education funding to its 1980 level when adjusted for inflation. While immediate restoration is impossible given the size of the Federal deficit, increases of the magnitude provided by the Hollings amendment would provide a meaningful step towards this goal. Those concerned about increased deficits should note that this Administration has added $101 billion to the national deficit for defense spending but has cut education to the detriment of America's economic and national security. Adherence to the levels provided by the Rudman amendment (Vote No. 74) would mean less funds for compensatory education of disadvantaged children and student financial assistance and, therefore, fewer opportunities for American youth to improve themselves in order to meet the challenges of tomorrow.

(OVER)

S. Con. Res. 27 (H. Con. Res. 91): Vote Nos. 66-86. 102-112. 171, 172.

RESULT: MOTION TO RECONSIDER REJECTED

YEAS (42)			NAYS (46)			NOT VOTING (12)	
Democrats (1 or 3%)	**Republicans (41 or 85%)**		**Democrats (39 or 97%)**		**Republicans (7 or 15%)**	**Democrats (6)**	**Republicans (6)**
Proxmire	Abdnor	Laxalt	Baucus	Lautenberg	Andrews	DeConcini—^{2}	Hatfield—^{2}
	Armstrong	Lugar	Bentsen	Leahy	Cochran	Dixon—^{2AN}	Helms—^{2}
	Baker	Mattingly	Biden	Levin	Cohen	Eagleton—^{2}	Kasten—^{2}
	Boschwitz	Nickles	Bingaman	Long	D'Amato	Glenn—^{2}	Mathias—^{2}
	Chafee	Packwood	Boren	Matsunaga	Jepsen	Huddleston—^{2AN}	McClure—^{2}
	Danforth	Percy	Bradley	Melcher	Specter	Kennedy—^{2AN}	Murkowski—^{2AY}
	Denton	Pressler	Bumpers	Metzenbaum	Stafford		
	Dole	Quayle	Burdick	Mitchell			
	Domenici	Roth	Byrd	Moynihan			
	Durenberger	Rudman	Chiles	Nunn			
	East	Simpson	Cranston	Pell			
	Garn	Stevens	Dodd	Pryor			
	Goldwater	Symms	Exon	Randolph			
	Gorton	Thurmond	Ford	Riegle			
	Grassley	Tower	Hart	Sarbanes			
	Hatch	Trible	Heflin	Sasser			
	Hawkins	Wallop	Hollings	Stennis			
	Hecht	Warner	Inouye	Tsongas			
	Heinz	Weicker	Jackson	Zorinsky			
	Humphrey	Wilson	Johnston				
	Kassebaum						

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

1—Official Business
2—Necessarily Absent
3—Illness
4—Other

SYMBOLS:

AY—Announced Yea
AN—Announced Nay
PY—Paired Yea
PN—Paired Nay

ANALYSIS OF ISSUE VOTED ON:

Party Cohesion	**Measure of Party Support on Issue as Voted on**	
	For (42)	*Against* (46)
Democrats— 98%	Democrats— 1 or 2%	Democrats— 39 or 85%
Republicans— 85%	Republicans— 41 or 98%	Republicans— 7 or 15%

Prepared and Compiled by Senate Democratic Policy Committee
Robert C. Byrd, Chairman

Opponents emphasized that the Senate cannot ignore the effect of the increases proposed by the Hollings amendment on the national debt. The Rudman amendment, which had been intended as a substitute for the Hollings amendment, would provide more reasonable increases in light of the current economic situation and in comparison to growth of other Federal programs. It would, however, provide for funding levels similar to the Hollings amendment for an important new math and science program. The problems plaguing education are of a general nature and cannot be solved by money alone. Funds spent on education will not necessarily translate into higher teachers' pay or improved performance in reading, writing, and mathematics..

Function 500: Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services—**Effect of Amendment.**

	1984		1985		1986	
	BA	O	BA	O	BA	O
			(in billions)			
Committee reported resolution	$30.800	$27.000	$27.500	$27.400	$27.500	$27.400
Rudman amendment	+ 0.400	+ 0.200	+ 0.400	+0.400	+ 0.400	+ 0.400
TOTAL	$31.200	$27.200	$27.900	$27.800	$27.900	$27.800

****

	1984		1985		1986	
	BA	O	BA	O	BA	O
Committee reported resolution	$30.800	$27.000	$27.500	$27.400	$27.500	$27.400
Hollings amendment #1237	+$1.500	+$0.255	+$1.791	+$1.558	+$1.887	+$1.797
TOTAL	$32.300	$27.255	$29.291	$28.958	$29.387	$29.197

SENATE VOTING RECORD

NO. 77

98th Congress
1st Session

May 6, 1983, 11:02 a.m.
Temp. Cong. Rec. p. S-6215

FIRST BUDGET RESOLUTION, 1984

BILL NO.: S. Con. Res. 27 (H. Con. Res. 91) **AMENDMENT NO.:** 1239

SUBJECT: **Hollings motion to table the Domenici amendment (as a substitute for the Hollings-Stafford, et al, amendment—Vote Nos. 75 and 76) increasing the education funding levels for FY 1984-86 by only $400 million per year above the reported levels, as in the Rudman amendment—Vote No. 74. (See also Vote No. 78.)**

NOTE: Proponents of the substitute stated that the votes related to the Hollings and Rudman amendments had failed to establish the position of the Senate on increased education funding. They argued that the Domenici substitute, which is identical to the Rudman amendment, would provide more reasonable increases in light of the current economic situation and in comparison to the growth of other Federal programs. It would, however, provide for funding levels similar to the Hollings amendment for an important new math and science program. The problems plaguing education are of a general nature and cannot be solved by money alone. Funds spent on education will not necessarily translate into higher teachers' pay or improved performance in reading, writing, and mathematics.

Opponents of the substitute argued that the previous two votes indicated that a majority of the Senate believes that the Rudman amendment's increases are insufficient. The $14.9 billion level for FY 1984 proposed by the Senate Budget Committee remains $7.2 billion less than the funds required to restore education funding to its 1980 level when adjusted for inflation. While immediate restoration is impossible given the size of the Federal deficit, increases of the magnitude provided by the Hollings amendment would provide a meaningful step toward this goal. Those concerned about increased deficits should note that this Administration has added $101 billion to the national deficit for defense spending but has cut education to the detriment of America's economic and national security. Adherence to the levels provided by the Rudman amendment would mean less funds for compensatory education of disadvantaged children and student financial assistance and, therefore, fewer opportunities for American youth to improve themselves in order to meet the challenges of tomorrow.

S. Con. Res. 27 (H. Con. Res. 91): Vote Nos. 66-86, 102-112, 171, 172.

RESULT: **MOTION TO TABLE AGREED TO**

YEAS (45)			NAYS (43)			NOT VOTING (12)	
Democrats (38 or 95%)		Republicans (7 or 15%)	Democrats (2 or 5%)	Republicans (41 or 85%)		Democrats (6)	Republicans (6)
Baucus	Johnston	Andrews	Proxmire	Abdnor	Laxalt	DeConcini—2	Hatfield—2AN
Bentsen	Lautenberg	Cochran	Zorinsky	Armstrong	Lugar	Dixon—2AY	Helms—2
Biden	Leahy	Cohen		Baker	Mattingly	Eagleton—2	Kasten—2
Bingaman	Levin	D'Amato		Boschwitz	Nickles	Glenn—2	Mathias—2
Boren	Long	Jepsen		Chafee	Packwood	Huddleston—2AY	McClure—2
Bradley	Matsunaga	Specter		Danforth	Percy	Kennedy—2AY	Murkowski—2AN
Bumpers	Melcher	Stafford		Denton	Pressler		
Burdick	Metzenbaum			Dole	Quayle		
Byrd	Mitchell			Domenici	Roth		
Chiles	Moynihan			Durenberger	Rudman		
Cranston	Nunn			East	Simpson		
Dodd	Pell			Garn	Stevens		
Exon	Pryor			Goldwater	Symms		
Ford	Randolph			Gorton	Thurmond		
Hart	Riegle			Grassley	Tower		
Heflin	Sarbanes			Hatch	Trible		
Hollings	Sasser			Hawkins	Wallop		
Inouye	Stennis			Hecht	Warner		
Jackson	Tsongas			Heinz	Weicker		
				Humphrey	Wilson		
				Kassebaum			

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

1—Official Business
2—Necessarily Absent
3—Illness
4—Other

SYMBOLS:

AY—Announced Yea
AN—Announced Nay
PY—Paired Yea
PN—Paired Nay

ANALYSIS OF ISSUE VOTED ON:

Party Cohesion	Measure of Party Support on Issue as Voted on	
	For (45)	*Against* (43)
Democrats— 95%	Democrats— 38 or 84%	Democrats— 2 or 5%
Republicans— 85%	Republicans— 7 or 16%	Republicans— 41 or 95%

Prepared and Compiled by Senate Democratic Policy Committee
Robert C. Byrd, Chairman

Function 500: Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services—**Effect of Amendment.**

	1984		1985		1986	
	BA	O	BA	O	BA	O
	(in billions)					
Domenici amendment totals	$31.200	$27.200	$27.900	$27.800	$27.900	$27.800
Hollings amendment totals	32.300	27.255	29.291	28.958	29.387	29.197
Domenici amendment compared to Hollings amendment	- 1.100	- 0.055	- 1.391	- 1.158	- 1.487	- 1.397

SENATE VOTING RECORD

NO. 78

98th Congress
1st Session

May 6, 1983, 11:57 a.m.
Temp. Cong. Rec. p. S-6219

FIRST BUDGET RESOLUTION, 1984

BILL NO.: S. Con. Res. 27 (H. Con. Res. 91) **AMENDMENT NO.:** 1240

SUBJECT: **Hollings, et al, amendment increasing the funding level for education by $1 billion in each of FY 1984-86 above the levels approved by the Budget Committee.** (See also Vote Nos. 74-77.)

NOTE: Proponents of the amendment offered this compromise in the face of Republican efforts to thwart the restoration of education funding to its 1980 levels. Educators and financial experts agree that the American educational system must be modernized to meet the challenges of changing technologies and improved foreign competition. The report of the National Commission on Excellence in Education, A Nation at Risk, warns that "our very future as a nation and as a people" is threatened because of the steady decline in educational achievement. A Wall Street-funded study found that "much of the Japanese success in the workplace appears attributable to . . . the effectiveness of Japanese primary and secondary education." Given this consensus and the steady erosion of education funding under the Reagan Administration, the Rudman amendment's increases (Vote No. 74) are too modest. The $14.9 billion level for FY 1984 proposed by the Senate Budget Committee remains $7.2 billion less than the funds required to restore education funding to its 1980 level when adjusted for inflation. While immediate restoration is impossible given the size of the Federal deficit, increases of the magnitude provided by the Hollings amendment would provide a meaningful step towards this goal. Those concerned about increased deficits should note that this Administration has added $101 billion to the national deficit for defense spending but has cut education funding to the detriment of America's economic and national security. Adherence to the levels provided by the Rudman amendment would mean less funds for compensatory education of disadvantaged children and student financial assistance and, therefore, fewer opportunities for American youth to improve themselves in order to meet the challenges of tomorrow.

(OVER)

S. Con. Res. 27 (H. Con. Res. 91): Vote Nos. 66-86, 102-112, 171, 172.

RESULT: AMENDMENT AGREED TO

YEAS (55)

Democrats (39 or 98%)

Baucus
Bentsen
Biden
Bingaman
Boren
Bradley
Bumpers
Burdick
Byrd
Chiles
Cranston
Dodd
Exon
Ford
Hart
Heflin
Hollings
Inouye
Jackson
Johnston
Lautenberg
Leahy
Levin
Long
Matsunaga
Melcher
Metzenbaum
Mitchell
Moynihan
Nunn
Pell
Pryor
Randolph
Riegle
Sarbanes
Sasser
Stennis
Tsongas
Zorinsky

Republicans (16 or 34%)

Andrews
Boschwitz
Chafee
Cochran
Cohen
D'Amato
Danforth
Hawkins
Heinz
Jepsen
Packwood
Percy
Pressler
Specter
Stafford
Weicker

NAYS (32)

Democrats (1 or 2%)

Proxmire

Republicans (31 or 66%)

Abdnor
Armstrong
Baker
Dole
Domenici
Durenberger
East
Garn
Goldwater
Gorton
Grassley
Hatch
Hecht
Humphrey
Kassebaum
Laxalt
Lugar
Mattingly
Nickles
Quayle
Roth
Rudman
Simpson
Stevens
Symms
Thurmond
Tower
Trible
Wallop
Warner
Wilson

NOT VOTING (13)

Democrats (6)

DeConcini—2
Dixon—2AY
Eagleton—2
Glenn—2
Huddleston—2AY
Kennedy—2AY

Republicans (7)

Denton—2
Hatfield—2AY
Helms—2
Kasten—2
Mathias—2PY
McClure—2
Murkowski—2PN

GENERAL PAIRS

Mathias Murkowski

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

2—Necessarily Absent

SYMBOLS:

AY—Announced Yea
AN—Announced Nay
PY—Paired Yea
PN—Paired Nay

ANALYSIS OF ISSUE VOTED ON:

Party Cohesion

Democrats— 98%
Republicans— 66%

Measure of Party Support on Issue as Voted on

For (55)
Democrats— 39 or 71%
Republicans— 16 or 29%

Against (32)
Democrats— 1 or 3%
Republicans— 31 or 97%

Prepared and Compiled by Senate Democratic Policy Committee
Robert C. Byrd, Chairman

Opponents emphasized that the Senate cannot ignore the effect of the increases proposed by the Hollings amendment on the national debt. The Rudman or Domenici amendments would provide more reasonable increases in light of the current economic situation and in comparison to growth in other Federal programs. The alternative amendment, however, would provide for funding levels similar to the Hollings amendment for an important new math and science program. Some contended that student achievement levels have declined as a result of increased Federal involvement in education. Funds spent on education will not necessarily translate into higher teachers' pay or improved performance in reading, writing, and mathematics.

On May 9, 1983, the Senate agreed, by voice vote, to Amendment No. 1245, making technical amendments to this amendment.

Function 500: Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services—**Effect of Amendment.**

	1984		1985		1986	
	BA	O	BA	O	BA	O
			(in billions)			
Committee reported resolution	$30.800	$27.000	$27.500	$27.400	$27.500	$27.400
Rudman amendment	+ 0.400	+ 0.200	+ 0.400	+0.400	+ 0.400	+ 0.400
TOTAL	$31.200	$27.200	$27.900	$27.800	$27.900	$27.800

****

Committee reported resolution	$30.800	$27.000	$27.500	$27.400	$27.500	$27.400
Hollings amendment #1240	+ 1.000	+ 0.250	+ 1.000	+ 1.000	+ 1.000	+ 1.000
TOTAL	$31.800	$27.250	$29.291	$28.400	$28.500	$28.500

SENATE VOTING RECORD

NO. 79

98th Congress
1st Session

May 6, 1983. 1:03 p.m.
Temp. Cong. Rec. p. S-6226

FIRST BUDGET RESOLUTION, 1984

BILL NO.: S. Con. Res. 27 (H. Con. Res. 91) **AMENDMENT NO.:** 1241

SUBJECT: **Domenici motion to table the Bradley, et al, amendment stating the sense of the Congress that the world economic recovery is being retarded by high U.S. interest rates and that the President and representatives of the other major industrial countries meeting at the Williamsburg Economic Summit should pursue a coordinated economic expansion to insure a worldwide economic recovery.**

NOTE: Proponents of the amendment stated that the worldwide recession and increasing prevalence of protectionism have made it extremely difficult for developing nations to repay huge debts. The overextended private banking system is imperiled by and ultimately threatened by economic collapse. Treasury Secretary Regan recently said that no single nation can be the engine for world recovery; all industrialized nations must work together for solid non-inflationary economic expansion. Paradoxically, most industrial countries are still adopting austerity measures to fight inflation instead of stimulating growth. The dilemma, proponents contended, is that each nation looks to the next to expand, and all countries expect the U.S. to take the lead. Interdependence and collective action should be emphasized in contrast to the preparatory documents for the summit which indicate that the U.S. will seek an agreement that recovery depends on each country establishing conditions for sustainable, noninflationary growth, rather than an international plan for expansionary action.

Although opponents did not argue the amendment's merits, they maintained that the budget resolution should not be burdened with language unrelated to the substance of the budget. This provision, they felt sure, would be dropped in conference with the House, making Senate passage alone inconclusive. They noted that a similar, free-standing resolution was introduced the morning this amendment was debated, causing concern about committee jurisdiction.

S. Con. Res. 27 (H. Con. Res. 91): Vote Nos. 66-86, 102-112, 171, 172.

RESULT: **MOTION TO TABLE AGREED TO**

YEAS (47)

Democrats (3 or 9%)

Proxmire
Stennis
Zorinsky

Republicans (44 or 100%)

Abdnor
Andrews
Armstrong
Baker
Boschwitz
Chafee
Cochran
D'Amato
Danforth
Dole
Domenici
East
Garn
Goldwater
Gorton
Grassley
Hatch
Hawkins
Hecht
Helms
Humphrey
Jepsen
Laxalt
Lugar
Mattingly
Nickles
Packwood
Percy
Pressler
Quayle
Roth
Rudman
Simpson
Specter
Stafford
Stevens
Symms
Thurmond
Tower
Trible
Wallop
Warner
Weicker
Wilson

NAYS (32)

Democrats (32 or 91%)

Bentsen
Biden
Bingaman
Boren
Bradley
Bumpers
Burdick
Byrd
Chiles
Cranston
Dodd
Ford
Heflin
Hollings
Inouye
Jackson
Johnston
Lautenberg
Leahy
Levin
Matsunaga
Metzenbaum
Mitchell
Moynihan
Nunn
Pell
Pryor
Randolph
Riegle
Sarbanes
Sasser
Tsongas

Republicans (0 or 0%)

NOT VOTING (20)

Democrats (11)

Baucus—^{2AN}
DeConcini—^{2}
Dixon—^{2}
Eagleton—^{2}
Exon—^{2}
Glenn—^{2}
Hart—^{2}
Huddleston—^{2}
Kennedy—^{2PN}
Long—^{2}
Melcher—^{2AN}

Republicans (9)

Cohen—^{2}
Denton—^{2AY}
Durenberger—^{2}
Hatfield—^{2}
Kassebaum—^{2}
Kasten—^{2AY}
Mathias—^{2}
McClure—^{2}
Murkowski—^{2AY}

LIVE PAIRS (1)

PRESENT AND GIVING:	RECEIVING:
Heinz (PY)	Kennedy (PN)

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

1—Official Business
2—Necessarily Absent

SYMBOLS:

AY—Announced Yea
AN—Announced Nay
PY—Paired Yea
PN—Paired Nay

ANALYSIS OF ISSUE VOTED ON:

Party Cohesion	Measure of Party Support on Issue as Voted on: *For* (47)	*Against* (32)
Democrats— 91%	Democrats— 3 or 6%	Democrats— 32 or 100%
Republicans— 100%	Republicans— 44 or 94%	Republicans— 0 or 0%

Prepared and Compiled by Senate Democratic Policy Committee
Robert C. Byrd, Chairman

SENATE VOTING RECORD

NO. 80

98th Congress
1st Session

May 10, 1983, 2:07 p.m.
Temp. Cong. Rec. p. S-6386

FIRST BUDGET RESOLUTION, 1984

BILL NO.: S. Con. Res. 27 (H. Con. Res. 91)

AMENDMENT NO.: 1242

SUBJECT: **Nunn-Jackson modified amendment increasing the funding level for defense in order to provide for a real growth increase in defense spending of 6.5 percent in FY 1984, 5.5 percent in 1985, and 5 percent in 1986.**

NOTE: Proponents maintained that defense funding must ensure the ability to field modern, ready military forces. At the same time, funding must be established at affordable, predictable and sustainable levels. This amendment would provide for a more balanced approach to setting budget priorities. Sudden reductions, such as those contained in the Budget Committee-reported resolution, inject management inefficiencies into defense programs. A more gradual approach is necessary to permit defense planners to adjust to a lower but more sustainable funding level. In addition, the readiness accounts must not be forced to bear a disproportionate share of the cuts. This amendment consciously sets ratios between budget authority and outlay reductions which would: (1) protect the continued emphasis on force readiness, (2) permit a sustained, but more moderate, pace of force modernization, and (3) guard against inevitable raids in future years on readiness whenever procurement expenditures are locked in by prior year budget authority decisions. By FY 1988, national defense will have been infused with the dollars needed to make up for a period of relative underfunding. After that, a real growth rate of less than 5 percent may be sufficient to meet the nation's criteria for defense funding.

Those opposing the amendment made no statements.

(OVER)

S. Con. Res. 27 (H. Con. Res. 91): Vote Nos. 66-86, 102-112, 171, 172.

RESULT: AMENDMENT REJECTED

YEAS (48)

Democrats (10 or 23%)

Bentsen
DeConcini
Heflin
Jackson
Long
Moynihan
Nunn
Randolph
Stennis
Zorinsky •

Republicans (38 or 72%)

Abdnor
Armstrong
Baker
Cochran
D'Amato
Denton
Dole
Domenici
East
Garn
Goldwater
Hatch
Hawkins
Hecht
Helms
Humphrey
Jepsen
Kassebaum
Kasten
Laxalt
Lugar
Mattingly
McClure
Murkowski
Nickles
Packwood
Pressler
Quayle
Roth
Simpson
Stevens
Symms
Thurmond
Tower
Trible
Wallop
Warner
Wilson

NAYS (48)

Democrats (33 or 77%)

Baucus
Biden
Bingaman
Boren
Bradley
Bumpers
Burdick
Byrd
Chiles
Cranston
Dixon
Dodd
Eagleton
Exon
Ford
Hollings
Huddleston
Inouye
Johnston
Lautenberg
Leahy
Levin
Matsunaga
Melcher
Metzenbaum
Mitchell
Pell
Proxmire
Pryor
Riegle
Sarbanes
Sasser
Tsongas

Republicans (15 or 28%)

Andrews
Boschwitz
Chafee
Cohen
Danforth
Durenberger
Gorton
Grassley
Hatfield
Mathias
Percy
Rudman
Specter
Stafford
Weicker

NOT VOTING (3)

Democrats (2)

Glenn—^{2}
Hart—^{2AN}

Republicans (1)

Heinz—^{2PY}

LIVE PAIRS (1)

PRESENT AND GIVING:	**RECEIVING:**
Kennedy (PN)	Heinz (PY)

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

1—Official Business
2—Necessarily Absent
3—Illness
4—Other

SYMBOLS:

AY—Announced Yea
AN—Announced Nay
PY—Paired Yea
PN—Paired Nay

ANALYSIS OF ISSUE VOTED ON:

Party Cohesion

Democrats— 77%
Republicans— 72%

Measure of Party Support on Issue as Voted on

For (48)
Democrats— 10 or 21%
Republicans— 38 or 79%

Against (48)
Democrats— 33 or 69%
Republicans— 15 or 31%

Prepared and Compiled by Senate Democratic Policy Committee
Robert C. Byrd, Chairman

Function 50: National Defense—**Effect of Amendment.**

	1984		1985		1986	
	BA	O	BA	O	BA	O
			(in billions)			
Committee resolution	$267.0	$241.5	$299.5	$270.7	$334.8	$300.0
Nunn-Jackson amendment	+4.9	+1.0	+2.9	+2.0	-0.2	+2.5

SENATE VOTING RECORD

NO. 83

98th Congress
1st Session

May 10, 1983, 3:23 p.m.
Temp. Cong. Rec. p. S-6390

FIRST BUDGET RESOLUTION, 1984

BILL NO.: S. Con. Res. 27 (H. Con. Res. 91) **AMENDMENT NO.:** 1252

SUBJECT: **Domenici motion to table the Melcher amendment transferring $200 million in FY 1984 budget authority and $100 million in FY 1984 outlays from the International Affairs Function to the Natural Resources and Environment Function (for soil conservation).** (See also Vote Nos. 105 and 145.)

NOTE: Proponents of the amendment contended that it recognizes the need to improve soil conservation as the Nation's highest priority without adding to the already huge Federal deficit. During the last twelve years, conservation programs have suffered from neglect and under funding. The need to protect our vital topsoil will further increase this year as unprecedented amounts of acreage are idled under the payment-in-kind program. Money spent on soil conservation would make a prudent investment in a prime national resource, and would create much needed jobs in rural areas. A transfer of funds is justified from the Foreign Assistance Function because its actual appropriations from the Treasury have doubled since 1979. In addition, funds transferred from foreign assistance would be used to further production of U.S. agricultural goods which are a vital part of the P.L. 480 Food for Peace program.

Opponents of the amendment noted that this budget assumes a five percent increase in funding for soil conservation programs over the 1983 level, which is substantially above the President's request. The budget also provides an actual increase of $500 million for the Natural Resources and Environment Function above the 1983 appropriations level. Furthermore, the emergency jobs bill provided an additional $5 million for 1983 for the Soil Conservation Service. While all are concerned that a vital function such as soil conservation receive adequate funding, similar arguments can be made for equally important and worthwhile programs that have suffered severe cuts in order to decrease the Federal deficit.

(OVER)

S. Con. Res. 27 (H. Con. Res. 91): Vote Nos. 66-86, 102-112, 171, 172.

RESULT: MOTION TO TABLE AGREED TO

YEAS (56)

Democrats (12 or 27%)

Biden
Bradley
Dodd
Inouye
Kennedy
Lautenberg
Matsunaga
Metzenbaum
Moynihan
Pell
Sarbanes
Tsongas •

Republicans (44 or 83%)

Armstrong
Baker
Boschwitz
Chafee
Cohen
D'Amato
Danforth
Denton
Dole
Domenici
Durenberger
East
Garn
Goldwater
Gorton
Hatch
Hatfield
Hawkins
Hecht
Kassebaum
Kasten
Laxalt
Lugar
Mathias
Mattingly
McClure
Murkowski
Packwood
Percy
Quayle
Roth
Rudman
Simpson
Specter
Stafford
Stevens
Symms
Thurmond
Tower
Trible
Wallop
Warner
Weicker
Wilson

NAYS (41)

Democrats (32 or 73%)

Baucus
Bentsen
Bingaman
Boren
Bumpers
Burdick
Byrd
Chiles
Cranston
DeConcini
Dixon
Eagleton
Exon
Ford
Heflin
Hollings
Huddleston
Jackson
Johnston
Leahy
Levin
Long
Melcher
Mitchell
Nunn
Proxmire
Pryor
Randolph
Riegle
Sasser
Stennis
Zorinsky

Republicans (9 or 17%)

Abdnor
Andrews
Cochran
Grassley
Helms
Humphrey
Jepsen
Nickles
Pressler

NOT VOTING (3)

Democrats (2)

Glenn—2
Hart—2

Republicans (1)

Heinz—2

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

1—Official Business
2—Necessarily Absent
3—Illness
4—Other

SYMBOLS:

AY—Announced Yea
AN—Announced Nay
PY—Paired Yea
PN—Paired Nay

ANALYSIS OF ISSUE VOTED ON:

Party Cohesion

Democrats— 73%
Republicans— 83%

Measure of Party Support on Issue as Voted on

For (56)
Democrats— 12 or 21%
Republicans— 44 or 79%

Against (41)
Democrats— 32 or 78%
Republicans— 9 or 22%

Prepared and Compiled by Senate Democratic Policy Committee
Robert C. Byrd, Chairman

32-733 O - 84 - 7

Effect of Amendment

(A dash indicates that the figure would not be changed.)

Function 300: **Natural Resources and Environment**

	1984		1985		1986	
	BA	O	BA	O	BA	O
	(in billions)					
Committee resolution	$12.0	$12.5	$12.2	$12.6	$12.5	$12.2
Melcher amendment	+0.2	+0.1	----	----	----	----

Function 150: **International Affairs**

	1984		1985		1986	
	BA	O	BA	O	BA	O
	(in billions)					
Committee resolution	$18.2	$12.7	$16.5	$12.8	$15.9	$12.8
Melcher amendment	–0.2	–0.1	----	----	----	----

SENATE VOTING RECORD

NO. 85

98th Congress
1st Session

May 12, 1983. 1:30 p.m.
Temp. Cong. Rec. p. S-6572

FIRST BUDGET RESOLUTION, 1984

BILL NO.: S. Con. Res. 27 (H. Con. Res. 91) **AMENDMENT NO.:** 1243

SUBJECT: **Chiles motion to table the Domenici-Baker substitute amendment to provide for a two-year budget resolution which would increase revenues by $2.6 billion in FY 1984 and $5.7 billion in 1985 (and avoids a 1986 revenue figure); increase defense spending by 7.5 percent in FY 1984; projects deficits of $204.0, $192.4 and $186.3 billion for FY 1983-85 respectively; and increase the public debt to $1.384, $1.620, and $1.857 trillion in FY 1983-85 respectively.** (See also Vote Nos. 102 and 107.)

NOTE: Proponents of the amendment emphasized that the key difference between it and the Gorton-Weicker substitute (Vote Nos. 86, 103, 108, and 110) lies in proposed taxes and the percentage of defense spending increases. This amendment allows for tax increases similar to those proposed by the President and much smaller than those of the Gorton-Weicker substitute. It sets defense spending targets midway between the President's request of ten percent and the Committee-reported level of five percent. It retains the bipartisan recommendation of the Senate Budget Committee on domestic spending, including entitlement savings in medicare, medicaid, farm price supports, and cost-of-living provisions for all Federal retirement programs. Budget projections for only two years were justified, they claimed, on the grounds that plans made this year to reduce spending or increase taxes three or four years hence are empty promises unless this Congress enacts changes that would effectively bind future Congresses. Plans to balance the budget have been delayed by the severe recession which has added $60 billion to the expected deficit level for 1982.

(OVER)

S. Con. Res. 27 (H. Con. Res. 91): Vote Nos. 66-86, 102-112, 171, 172.

RESULT: **MOTION TO TABLE AGREED TO** ADMINISTRATION POSITION: YEA

YEAS (52) Democrats (45 or 98%)		YEAS (52) Republicans (7 or 13%)	NAYS (48) Democrats (1 or 2%)	NAYS (48) Republicans (47 or 87%)		NOT VOTING (0)
Baucus	Johnston	Andrews	Heflin	Abdnor	Kassebaum	
Bentsen	Kennedy	Chafee		Armstrong	Kasten	
Biden	Lautenberg	Hatfield		Baker	Laxalt	
Bingaman	Leahy	Mathias		Boschwitz	Lugar	
Boren	Levin	Packwood		Cochran	Mattingly	
Bradley	Long	Stafford		Cohen	McClure	
Bumpers	Matsunaga	Weicker		D'Amato	Murkowski	
Burdick	Melcher			Danforth	Nickles	
Byrd	Metzenbaum			Denton	Percy	
Chiles	Mitchell			Dole	Pressler	
Cranston	Moynihan			Domenici	Quayle	
DeConcini	Nunn			Durenberger	Roth	
Dixon	Pell			East	Rudman	
Dodd	Proxmire			Garn	Simpson	
Eagleton	Pryor			Goldwater	Specter	
Exon	Randolph			Gorton	Stevens	
Ford	Riegle			Grassley	Symms	
Glenn	Sarbanes			Hatch	Thurmond	
Hart	Sasser			Hawkins	Tower	
Hollings	Stennis			Hecht	Trible	
Huddleston	Tsongas			Heinz	Wallop	
Inouye	Zorinsky			Helms	Warner	
Jackson				Humphrey	Wilson	
				Jepsen		

ANALYSIS OF ISSUE VOTED ON:

Party Cohesion	Measure of Party Support on Issue as Voted on: *For* (52)	*Against* (48)
Democrats— 98%	Democrats— 45 or 87%	Democrats— 1 or 2%
Republicans— 87%	Republicans— 7 or 13%	Republicans— 47 or 98%

Prepared and Compiled by Senate Democratic Policy Committee
Robert C. Byrd, Chairman

Opponents of the amendment noted that, in spite of the overwhelming Republican support for the Reagan program and budget victories during the first two years of the Reagan Administration, the Republican-controlled Budget Committee has yet to reconcile the program with a balanced budget. As occurred last year, the Senate is being asked to reject the Committee's resolution in favor of a partisan measure drafted by the Republican caucus which includes targets for only two years in order to avoid the unacceptable deficits their program would produce. Like the 1981 Domenici amendment (Vote No. 464, 97th-1st), the Republican substitute merely provides language stating that Congress should cut the deficit in future years. These deficits are a product of the Republican program which has reduced Federal revenues by $1 trillion for the 1984-88 period and increased defense spending by $1.7 trillion for the same period. As a result, the public debt will increase approximately $1 trillion. Expectations of massive Federal borrowing to pay for defense spending increases and an unfair tax cut prevent any further decline in interest rates. During the past 25 years, Federal participation in the credit markets averaged only 20 percent. However, the Federal government now takes a 38 percent share of the credit market and, under the Domenici-Baker substitute, would consume between 87 and 75 percent of the market over the next four years. The prospect of continued massive Federal borrowing must be addressed if an economic recovery is to be sustained. Congress has acted responsibly to cut projected spending of nondefense programs by $387 billion over the 1982-87 period. It is the President and the Majority Leadership's refusal to consider a reduction in the growth of defense spending or a change in tax policy that will lead to deficits that threaten this economic recovery. Some expressed support for the bipartisan substitute which would produce a downward deficit trend in order to relieve pressure on the credit market and to sustain economic growth.

COMPARISON OF DOMENICI-BAKER SUBSTITUTE WITH GORTON-WEICKER MODIFIED SUBSTITUTE

	1984			1985			1986	
	Domenici Baker Sub.	Gorton Weicker Modified Sub.	Domenici Compared with Gorton	Domenici Baker Sub.	Gorton Weicker Modified Sub.	Domenici Compared with Gorton	*Domenici Baker Sub.	Gorton Weicker Modified Sub.
				($ in billions)				
Revenues	$ 658.00	$ 664.30	$ -6.30	$ 729.20	$ 736.18	$ -6.98	--	$ 829.90
Rev. Inc.	(2.60)	(8.90)	--	(5.70)	(12.68)	--	--	(51.00)
Deficits	192.40	184.40	+8.00	186.30	178.40	+7.90	--	142.47
Public Debt	1,620.20	1,612.20	+8.00	1,857.20	1,841.30	+15.90	--	2,041.37
Budget Auth.								
NonDefense	643.00	641.25	+1.75	686.00	685.12	+0.88	--	719.65
Defense	275.00	270.65	+4.35	304.30	300.95	+3.35	--	333.06
Outlays								
Outlays								
NonDefense	608.60	606.10	+2.50	642.90	642.02	+0.88	--	669.95
Defense	241.80	242.60	-0.80	272.60	272.55	+0.05	--	302.42
Def. Spending								
Real Growth	7.5%	6.0%	--	5.0%	5.5%	--	--	5.0%

*The Dominici-Baker substitute provided no targets for 1986.

SENATE VOTING RECORD

NO. 89

98th Congress
1st Session

May 17, 1983, 3:03 p.m.
Temp. Cong. Rec. p. S-6812

IMMIGRATION REFORM

BILL NO.: S. 529 **AMENDMENT NO.:** 1271

TITLE: "Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1983."

SUBJECT: **Bumpers amendment striking the section that gives an immigration preference to qualified immigrants who have invested, or shown their intention to invest, at least $250,000 in a U.S. enterprise, managed by the alien, that would employ four persons not related to the immigrant.**

NOTE: Proponents contended that the third preference favors "fat cats" over truly deserving people who would be desirable immigrants. Thus the preference would betray the national character by selling America to those with enough money. This preference category was originally proposed before immigration quotas were tightened; preferences to the wealthy, they asserted, should now be tightened rather than loosened so that other new-seed immigrants may enter.

Opponents contended that an increase in independent immigrants is necessary because, as levels of legal immigration remain the same, independent categories are being squeezed out by family reunification. Independent immigration, they asserted, is the essence of our legal immigration, and this preference serves the purpose of preserving the system. It is not elitist and the numbers entering under this category would be very small.

S. 529: Vote Nos. 64, 65, 89-101.

RESULT: AMENDMENT AGREED TO

YEAS (51)

Democrats
(41 or 95%)

Baucus
Bentsen
Biden
Bingaman
Boren
Bradley
Bumpers
Burdick
Byrd
Cranston
Dixon
Dodd
Eagleton
Exon
Ford
Glenn
Hart
Heflin
Huddleston
Inouye
Jackson
Johnston
Kennedy
Lautenberg
Leahy
Levin
Long
Matsunaga
Melcher
Metzenbaum
Mitchell
Moynihan
Nunn
Proxmire
Pryor
Randolph
Riegle
Sarbanes
Sasser
Stennis
Zorinsky

Republicans
(10 or 19%)

Cohen
Denton
Durenberger
East
Helms
Humphrey
Packwood
Rudman
Specter
Weicker

NAYS (46)

Democrats
(2 or 5%)

Chiles
Tsongas

Republicans
(44 or 81%)

Abdnor
Andrews
Armstrong
Baker
Boschwitz
Chafee
Cochran
D'Amato
Danforth
Dole
Domenici
Garn
Goldwater
Gorton
Grassley
Hatch
Hatfield
Hawkins
Hecht
Heinz
Jepsen
Kassebaum
Kasten
Laxalt
Lugar
Mathias
Mattingly
McClure
Murkowski
Nickles
Percy
Pressler
Quayle
Roth
Simpson
Stafford
Stevens
Symms
Thurmond
Tower
Trible
Wallop
Warner
Wilson

NOT VOTING (3)

Democrats (3)

DeConcini—2
Hollings—2
Pell—2AY

Republicans (0)

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

1—Official Business
2—Necessarily Absent
3—Illness
4—Other

SYMBOLS:

AY—Announced Yea
AN—Announced Nay
PY—Paired Yea
PN—Paired Nay

ANALYSIS OF ISSUE VOTED ON:

Party Cohesion	Measure of Party Support on Issue as Voted on	
	For (51)	*Against* (46)
Democrats— 95%	Democrats— 41 or 80%	Democrats— 2 or 4%
Republicans— 81%	Republicans— 10 or 20%	Republicans— 44 or 96%

Prepared and Compiled by Senate Democratic Policy Committee
Robert C. Byrd, Chairman

SENATE VOTING RECORD

NO. 96

98th Congress
1st Session

May 18, 1983, 3:36 p.m.
Temp. Cong. Rec. p. S-6932

IMMIGRATION REFORM

BILL NO.: S. 529

AMENDMENT NO.: 1274

TITLE: "Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1983."

SUBJECT: **Bradley, et al. amendment providing for 100 percent Federal reimbursement during a three-year transition period for State and local costs of public assistance for newly legalized aliens.**

NOTE: Proponents contended that the amendment was an insurance policy that would guarantee State and local governments against incurring excessive burdens. The fiscal burden, they feared, would rest on the States with the heaviest concentration of newly legalized aliens, who are ineligible for almost every Federal assistance program, while those States have no guarantee of even minimal reimbursement through the block grant established by the bill. Since decisions on immigration policy are made at the Federal level, the Federal government should bear the financial consequences of those decisions, particularly the decision to implement legalization of unknown numbers of aliens.

Opponents contended that the bill recognizes the responsibilities of the Federal government and the benefits of legalization to the States and local governments. People who will become legalized under the bill are those who have been working and contributing to local communities by paying taxes, both directly and indirectly. Unlike refugees, who might be a Federal responsibility, legalized aliens are a shared responsibility, as acknowledged in the block grant program. In addition, aliens who become legalized will result in no increase in education costs, opponents maintained, since alien children are already constitutionally guaranteed a free public education.

S. 529: Vote Nos. 64, 65, 89-101.

RESULT: AMENDMENT REJECTED

YEAS (37)

Democrats (29 or 71%)

Bentsen
Biden
Bingaman
Boren
Bradley
Bumpers
Burdick
Byrd
Chiles
Cranston
Dixon
Dodd
Glenn
Inouye
Jackson
Johnston
Lautenberg
Levin
Matsunaga
Metzenbaum
Moynihan
Pell
Pryor
Randolph
Riegle
Sarbanes
Sasser
Tsongas
Zorinsky

Republicans (8 or 15%)

Andrews
D'Amato
Durenberger
Hawkins
Heinz
Specter
Tower
Wilson

NAYS (57)

Democrats (12 or 29%)

Baucus
Eagleton
Exon
Ford
Huddleston
Kennedy
Leahy
Long
Melcher
Mitchell
Proxmire
Stennis

Republicans (45 or 85%)

Abdnor
Armstrong
Baker
Boschwitz
Chafee
Cochran
Cohen
Danforth
Denton
Dole
Domenici
East
Garn
Goldwater
Gorton
Grassley
Hatch
Hatfield
Hecht
Helms
Humphrey
Jepsen
Kassebaum
Kasten
Laxalt
Lugar
Mathias
Mattingly
McClure
Murkowski
Nickles
Packwood
Percy
Pressler
Quayle
Roth
Rudman
Simpson
Stevens
Symms
Thurmond
Trible
Wallop
Warner
Weicker

NOT VOTING (6)

Democrats (5)

DeConcini—2
Hart—2
Heflin—2
Hollings—2
Nunn—2

Republicans (1)

Stafford—2

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

1—Official Business
2—Necessarily Absent
3—Illness
4—Other

SYMBOLS:

AY—Announced Yea
AN—Announced Nay
PY—Paired Yea
PN—Paired Nay

ANALYSIS OF ISSUE VOTED ON:

Party Cohesion

Democrats—71%
Republicans—85%

Measure of Party Support on Issue as Voted on

For (37)
Democrats—29 or 78%
Republicans—8 or 22%

Against (57)
Democrats—12 or 21%
Republicans—45 or 79%

Prepared and Compiled by Senate Democratic Policy Committee
Robert C. Byrd, Chairman

SENATE VOTING RECORD

NO. 102

98th Congress
1st Session

May 19, 1983, 5:27 p.m.
Temp. Cong. Rec. p. S-7091

FIRST BUDGET RESOLUTION, 1984

BILL NO.: S. Con. Res. 27 (H. Con. Res. 91)

SUBJECT: **Domenici-Baker, et al. modified Committee substitute amendment which provides for a two-year budget which includes a 7.1 percent real growth rate in defense spending in FY 1984 and 5 percent in 1985; provides for revenue increases of $3.5 billion in FY 1984 and $6.4 billion in 1985; projects deficits of $193 billion in FY 1984 and $186 billion in 1985; reflects an actual COLA of 3.5 percent instead of the 4.1 percent assumed; and includes the three amendments adopted earlier by the Senate that provide $900 million for health insurance for the unemployed, increase funds for education programs by $1 billion in each of FY 1984-86, and increase Medicaid funds for assistance to low-income pregnant women and newborn children.** (See also Vote Nos. 85 and 107.)

NOTE: Proponents noted that the amendment was essentially the same as the previous Domenici-Baker substitute (Vote No. 85), except for a downward revision in defense spending from 7.5 to 7.1 percent for 1984, a minor reduction in the COLA assumed for Functions 600, 650, and 700 for FY 1984, and inclusion of the amendments already adopted earlier by the Senate. Similarly, the amendment presents the same choices between it and the Gorton-Weicker substitute on defense spending and tax policies. A choice must be made between a $9.87 billion revenue increase over two years and a $72.5 billion increase over three years as proposed by the Gorton-Weicker substitute. Its larger defense spending increase is closer to the President's request of ten percent. In addition, it provides targets for only two years because outyear savings have proven illusory in the past. The blame for large deficits lays, they argued, with uncontrolled entitlement spending, and is not rectified through increased taxes. History teaches that increased Federal revenues are spent on new programs, not on lowering the deficit.

(OVER)

S. Con. Res. 27 (H. Con. Res. 91): Vote Nos. 66-86, 102-112, 171, 172.

RESULT: AMENDMENT REJECTED

ADMINISTRATION POSITION: NAY

YEAS (43)

Democrats (0 or 0%)

Republicans (43 or 81%)

Abdnor
Armstrong
Baker
Boschwitz
Cochran
Cohen
D'Amato
Danforth
Denton
Dole
Domenici
Durenberger
Garn
Goldwater
Grassley
Hatch
Hawkins
Hecht
Heinz
Helms
Humphrey
Kassebaum
Kasten
Laxalt
Lugar
Mattingly
McClure
Murkowski
Percy
Pressler
Quayle
Roth
Rudman
Simpson
Specter
Stevens
Symms
Thurmond
Tower
Trible
Wallop
Warner
Wilson

NAYS (56)

Democrats (46 or 100%)

Baucus
Bentsen
Biden
Bingaman
Boren
Bradley
Bumpers
Burdick
Byrd
Chiles
Cranston
DeConcini
Dixon
Dodd
Eagleton
Exon
Ford
Glenn
Hart
Heflin
Hollings
Huddleston
Inouye
Jackson
Johnston
Kennedy
Lautenberg
Leahy
Levin
Long
Matsunaga
Melcher
Metzenbaum
Mitchell
Moynihan
Nunn
Pell
Proxmire
Pryor
Randolph
Riegle
Sarbanes
Sasser
Stennis
Tsongas
Zorinsky

Republicans (10 or 19%)

Andrews
Chafee
East
Gorton
Hatfield
Mathias
Nickles
Packwood
Stafford
Weicker

NOT VOTING (1)

Democrats (0)

Republicans (1)

Jepsen—2

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

1—Official Business
2—Necessarily Absent
3—Illness
4—Other

SYMBOLS:

AY—Announced Yea
AN—Announced Nay
PY—Paired Yea
PN—Paired Nay

ANALYSIS OF ISSUE VOTED ON:

Party Cohesion

Democrats— 100%
Republicans— 81%

Measure of Party Support on Issue as Voted on

For (43)
Democrats— 0 or 0%
Republicans— 43 or 100%

Against (56)
Democrats— 46 or 82%
Republicans— 10 or 18%

Prepared and Compiled by Senate Democratic Policy Committee
Robert C. Byrd, Chairman

Opponents criticized the pending amendment because it provides targets for only two years and, consequently, fails to produce a downward deficit trend during the coming economic recovery. This amendment merely ratifies the failed policies of the past that have reduced Federal revenues by $1 trillion for the 1984-88 period and increased defense spending by $1.7 billion. As a result, the public debt will increase approximately $1.008 trillion. Congress has acted responsibly to cut projected spending of nondefense programs by a projected $387 billion over the 1982-87 period. It is the President and the Majority Leadership's refusal to consider a reduction in defense spending, or a change in tax policy, that will lead to deficits that threaten economic recovery.

COMPARISON OF DOMENICI-BAKER SUBSTITUTE WITH GORTON-WEICKER SUBSTITUTE

	1984			1985			1986	
	Domenici Baker Sub.	Gorton Weicker Sub.	Domenici Compared with Gorton	Domenici Baker Sub.	Gorton Weicker Sub.	Domenici Compared with Gorton	*Domenici Baker Sub.	Gorton Weicker Sub.
					($ in billions)			
Revenues	$658.90	$671.10	$-6.30	$729.87	$743.08	$-13.21	--	$835.90
Rev. Inc.	(3.50)	(9.90)	--	(6.37)	(13.68)	--	--	(51.00)
Deficits	193.00	178.60	+14.40	186.05	167.70	+18.35	--	130.10
Public Debt	1,620.80	1,606.40	+14.40	1,857.55	1,824.80	+32.75	--	2,012.50
Budget Auth.								
NonDefense	644.85	644.05	+0.80	687.62	685.42	+2.20	--	717.15
Defense	274.00	270.65	+3.35	303.20	300.95	+2.25	--	333.06
Outlays								
NonDefense	608.90	608.10	+0.80	643.32	641.12	+2.20	--	666.15
Defense	243.00	241.60	+1.40	272.60	269.65	+2.95	--	299.85
Def. Spending Real Growth	7.1%	6.0%	--	5.0	5.5%	--	--	5.0%

*The Dominici-Baker substitute provided no targets for 1986.

SENATE VOTING RECORD

NO. 103

98th Congress
1st Session

May 19, 1983. 7:31 p.m.
Temp. Cong. Rec. p. S-7102

FIRST BUDGET RESOLUTION, 1984

BILL NO.: S. Con. Res. 27 (H. Con. Res. 91) **AMENDMENT NO.:** 1285

SUBJECT: **Gorton-Weicker, et al, substitute amendment which provides for a 6 percent real growth rate in defense spending in FY 1984, 5.5 percent in 1985, and 5 percent in 1986; provides for revenue increases of $9.9 billion in FY 1984, $13.7 billion in 1985, and $51 billion in 1986; projects deficits of $178.6 billion in FY 1984, $167.7 billion in 1985, and $130.1 billion in 1986; reflects an actual COLA of 3.5 percent instead of the 4.1 percent assumed; and includes the three amendments adopted earlier by the Senate that provide $900 million for health insurance for the unemployed, increase funds for education programs by $1 billion in each of FY 1984-86, and increase Medicaid funds for assistance to low-income pregnant women and newborn children.** (See also Vote Nos. 86, 108, and 110.)

NOTE: Proponents emphasized that this amendment was a bipartisan effort to preserve the budget process by providing a reasonable compromise on the two major items in contention, lower deficits and the rate of defense spending growth. It differs from the first Gorton-Weicker substitute (Vote No. 86) only in reflecting lower COLA adjustments for Functions 600, 650, and 700 and updated economic growth projections. Since the preceding Domenici-Baker substitute (Vote No. 102) failed by a wider margin than the first vote on it (Vote No. 85), this amendment represents the last hope for a budget that can be used to restrain spending and deficits. Without firm budget targets, the appropriations process is likely to produce even higher spending than now anticipated. Deficits of $200 billion in the coming years could push up interest rates and abort a sustained recovery, which is the only hope the 12 million unemployed have for a job and a secure future. This amendment provides a three-year reconciliation that reduces deficits below the President's budget and the Domenici-Baker substitute. Its defense spending increases represent a middle ground between the Republican substitute and the House-passed levels. It is consistent with past efforts by Congress to restrain domestic spending, which have yielded a projected savings of $387 billion over the 1982-87 period, because it includes substantial reconciliation instructions for a number of entitlement programs. Revenue increases are smaller than those provided by the House for the 1984-85 period in response to the President's concerns about choking off the recovery. Furthermore, the total revenue increase is modest, considering that it equals less than one-tenth of the Reagan tax cut enacted in 1981.

(OVER)

S. Con. Res. 27 (H. Con. Res. 91): Vote Nos. 66-86, 102-112, 171, 172.

RESULT: AMENDMENT REJECTED

YEAS (48)			NAYS (52)			NOT VOTING (0)
Democrats (32 or 70%)		**Republicans (16 or 30%)**	**Democrats (14 or 30%)**	**Republicans (38 or 70%)**		
Bentsen	Jackson	Andrews	Baucus	Abdnor	Kasten	
Biden	Kennedy	Boschwitz	Boren	Armstrong	Laxalt	
Bingaman	Lautenberg	Chafee	Bumpers	Baker	Lugar	
Bradley	Leahy	D'Amato	DeConcini	Cochran	Mattingly	
Burdick	Levin	Danforth	Exon	Cohen	McClure	
Byrd	Matsunaga	Gorton	Heflin	Denton	Murkowski	
Chiles	Metzenbaum	Hatfield	Hollings	Dole	Nickles	
Cranston	Mitchell	Heinz	Johnston	Domenici	Percy	
Dixon	Moynihan	Kassebaum	Long	Durenberger	Pressler	
Dodd	Pell	Mathias	Melcher	East	Quayle	
Eagleton	Randolph	Packwood	Nunn	Garn	Roth	
Ford	Riegle	Rudman	Proxmire	Goldwater	Stevens	
Glenn	Sarbanes	Simpson	Pryor	Grassley	Symms	
Hart	Sasser	Specter	Zorinsky	Hatch	Thurmond	
Huddleston	Stennis	Stafford		Hawkins	Tower	
Inouye	Tsongas	Weicker		Hecht	Trible	
				Helms	Wallop	
				Humphrey	Warner	
				Jepsen	Wilson	

ANALYSIS OF ISSUE VOTED ON:

Party Cohesion	Measure of Party Support on Issue as Voted on	
	For (48)	*Against* (52)
Democrats— 70%	Democrats— 32 or 67%	Democrats— 14 or 27%
Republicans— 70%	Republicans— 16 or 33%	Republicans— 38 or 73%

Prepared and Compiled by Senate Democratic Policy Committee
Robert C. Byrd, Chairman

Opponents asserted that this amendment provides unacceptably high deficits and tax increases. Higher taxes, they argued, will not be used to balance the budget, but for more Federal spending. The deficits of today are caused by unrestrained entitlement spending, they contended, and no balanced budget can be achieved until these "sacred cows" are trimmed.

COMPARISON OF DOMENICI-BAKER SUBSTITUTE WITH GORTON-WEICKER SUBSTITUTE

	1984			1985			1986	
	Gorton Weicker Sub.	Domenici Baker Sub.	Gorton Compared with Domenici	Gorton Weicker Sub.	Domenici Baker Sub.	Gorton Compared with Domenici	Gorton Weicker Sub.	*Domenici Baker Sub.
				($ in billions)				
Revenues	$671.10	$658.90	$ + 6.30	$743.08	$729.87	$ + 13.21	$835.90	--
Rev. Inc.	(9.90)	(3.50)	--	(13.68)	(6.37)	--	(51.00)	--
Deficits	178.60	193.00	-14.40	167.70	186.05	-18.35	130.10	--
Public Debt	1,606.40	1,620.80	-14.40	1,824.80	1,857.55	-32.75	2,012.50	--
Budget Auth.								
NonDefense	644.05	644.85	-0.80	685.42	687.62	-2.20	717.15	--
Defense	270.65	274.00	-3.35	300.95	303.20	-2.25	333.06	--
Outlays								
NonDefense	608.10	608.90	-0.80	641.12	643.32	-2.20	666.15	--
Defense	241.60	243.00	+ 1.40	269.65	272.60	-2.95	299.85	--
Def. Spending Real Growth	6.0%	7.1%	--	5.5%	5.0%	--	5.0%	--

*The Dominici-Baker substitute provided no targets for 1986.

SENATE VOTING RECORD

NO. 105

98th Congress
1st Session

May 19, 1983, 8:58 p.m.
Temp. Cong. Rec. p. S-7114

FIRST BUDGET RESOLUTION, 1984

BILL NO.: S. Con. Res. 27 (H. Con. Res. 91) **AMENDMENT NO.:** 1288

SUBJECT: **Domenici motion to table the Melcher-Randolph-Pressler amendment (to the further modified Domenici-Baker Committee substitute—Vote No. 107) transferring $89 million from Function 150 (International Affairs) to Function 300 (Natural Resources and Environment) for soil conservation programs. (See also Vote Nos. 83 and 145.)**

NOTE: Proponents noted that they had already offered an amendment (Vote No. 83), which, if adopted, would have transferred $100 million, instead of $89 million, from the International Affairs Function to the Natural Resources and Environment Function. Congress must meet the need to improve soil conservation as the Nation's highest priority without adding to the already huge Federal deficit. During the last twelve years, conservation programs have suffered from neglect and under-funding. The need to protect our vital topsoil will further increase this year as unprecedented amounts of acreage are idled under the payment-in-kind program. Money spent on soil conservation would make a prudent investment in a prime national resource, and would create much needed jobs in rural areas. A transfer of funds is justified from the Foreign Assistance Function because its actual appropriations from the Treasury have doubled since 1979. In addition, funds transferred from foreign assistance would be used to further production of U.S. agricultural goods which are a vital part of the P.L. 480 Food for Peace program.

No statements were made in opposition. Opponents of the previous Melcher amendment, however, noted that this budget already assumes a five percent increase in funding for soil conservation programs over the 1983 level, which is substantially above the President's request. It also provides an actual increase of $500 million for the Natural Resources and Environment Function above the 1983 appropriations level. Furthermore, the emergency jobs bill provided an additional $5 million for 1983 for the Soil Conservation Service. While all are concerned that a vital function such as soil conservation receives adequate funding, similar arguments can be made for equally important and worthwhile programs that have suffered severe cuts in order to decrease the Federal deficit.

(OVER)

S. Con. Res. 27 (H. Con. Res. 91): Vote Nos. 66-86, 102-112, 171, 172.

RESULT: **MOTION TO TABLE AGREED TO**

YEAS (57)

Democrats
(15 or 33%)

Bentsen
Biden
Bradley
Dodd
Glenn
Hart
Inouye
Kennedy
Lautenberg
Matsunaga
Metzenbaum
Moynihan
Pell
Sarbanes
Tsongas

Republicans
(42 or 78%)

Armstrong
Baker
Boschwitz
Chafee
D'Amato
Danforth
Denton
Dole
Domenici
Durenberger
Garn
Goldwater
Gorton
Grassley
Hatch
Hatfield
Hawkins
Hecht
Heinz
Kassebaum
Kasten
Laxalt
Lugar
Mathias
Mattingly
Murkowski
Packwood
Percy
Quayle
Roth
Rudman
Simpson
Specter
Stafford
Stevens
Thurmond
Tower
Trible
Wallop
Warner
Weicker
Wilson

NAYS (43)

Democrats
(31 or 67%)

Baucus
Bingaman
Boren
Bumpers
Burdick
Byrd
Chiles
Cranston
DeConcini
Dixon
Eagleton
Exon
Ford
Heflin
Hollings
Huddleston
Jackson
Johnston
Leahy
Levin
Long
Melcher
Mitchell
Nunn
Proxmire
Pryor
Randolph
Riegle
Sasser
Stennis
Zorinsky

Republicans
(12 or 22%)

Abdnor
Andrews
Cochran
Cohen
East
Helms
Humphrey
Jepsen
McClure
Nickles
Pressler
Symms

NOT VOTING (0)

ANALYSIS OF ISSUE VOTED ON:

Party Cohesion

Democrats— 67%
Republicans— 78%

Measure of Party Support on Issue as Voted on

For (57)
Democrats— 15 or 26%
Republicans— 42 or 74%

Against (43)
Democrats— 31 or 72%
Republicans— 12 or 28%

Prepared and Compiled by Senate Democratic Policy Committee
Robert C. Byrd, Chairman

Effect of Amendment

(A dash indicates that the figure would not be changed.)

Function 300: **Natural Resources and Environment**

	1983		1984		1985	
	BA	O	BA	O	BA	O
	(in billions)					
Committee modified resolution	$12.500	$12.800	$12.000	$12.500	$12.200	$12.600
Melcher amendment	---	---	+0.150	+0.089	----	----

Function 150: **International Affairs**

	1983		1984		1985	
	BA	O	BA	O	BA	O
	(in billions)					
Committee modified resolution	$24.900	$11.500	$18.200	$12.700	$16.500	$12.800
Melcher amendment	---	---	-0.150	-0.089	----	----

SENATE VOTING RECORD

NO. 107

98th Congress
1st Session

May 19, 1983, 9:37 p.m.
Temp. Cong. Rec. p. S-7115

FIRST BUDGET RESOLUTION, 1984

BILL NO.: S. Con. Res. 27 (H. Con. Res. 91)

AMENDMENT NO.: 1286

SUBJECT: Domenici-Baker Committee substitute amendment which provides a two-year budget which includes a 7.1 percent real growth rate in defense spending in FY 1984 and 5 percent in 1985; provides for revenue increases of $3.5 billion in FY 1984 and $6.4 billion in 1985; projects deficits of $193 billion in FY 1984 and $186 billion in 1985; reflects an actual COLA of 3.5 percent instead of the 4.1 percent assumed; and includes the three amendments adopted earlier by the Senate that provide $900 million for health insurance for the unemployed, increase funds for education programs by $1 billion in each of FY 1984-86, and increase Medicaid funds for assistance to low-income pregnant women and newborn children. (See also Vote Nos. 85 and 102.)

NOTE: Proponents noted that the amendment is identical to the previously defeated substitute (Vote No. 102) except for an adjustment to the reconciliation instructions. It is merely a vehicle for another vote on the Domenici-Baker amendment in the wake of the defeat of the Gorton-Weicker substitute. The Senate should not fail to pass a budget resolution and jeopardize the budget process because of small differences over the rate of defense spending growth or large, ill-defined tax increases in future years.

Opponents noted that little had changed since the Senate rejected the partisan Domenici-Baker substitute (Vote No. 102) by an even wider margin than previously (Vote No. 85). Because the Senate is closely divided, it is clear that no such partisan amendment can be passed on the strength of a single party's membership. In contrast to the pending amendment, the Gorton-Weicker substitute gained the support of 32 Democrats and 16 Republicans on the previous vote, or two more than when first considered (Vote No. 84). The Senate should defeat the Domenici-Baker substitute in favor of the bipartisan alternative, on which a motion to reconsider is still eligible.

S. Con. Res. 27 (H. Con. Res. 91): Vote Nos. 66-86, 102-112, 171, 172.

RESULT: **AMENDMENT REJECTED**

ADMINISTRATION POSITION: NAY

YEAS (43)

Democrats
(0 or 0%)

Republicans
(43 or 80%)

Abdnor
Armstrong
Baker
Boschwitz
Cochran
Cohen
D'Amato
Danforth
Denton
Dole
Domenici
Durenberger
Garn
Goldwater
Gorton
Grassley
Hatch
Hawkins
Hecht
Heinz
Jepsen
Kassebaum

Kasten
Laxalt
Lugar
Mattingly
McClure
Murkowski
Percy
Pressler
Quayle
Roth
Rudman
Simpson
Specter
Stevens
Symms
Thurmond
Tower
Trible
Wallop
Warner
Wilson

NAYS (57)

Democrats
(46 or 100%)

Baucus
Bentsen
Biden
Bingaman
Boren
Bradley
Bumpers
Burdick
Byrd
Chiles
Cranston
DeConcini
Dixon
Dodd
Eagleton
Exon
Ford
Glenn
Hart
Heflin
Hollings
Huddleston
Inouye

Jackson
Johnston
Kennedy
Lautenberg
Leahy
Levin
Long
Matsunaga
Melcher
Metzenbaum
Mitchell
Moynihan
Nunn
Pell
Proxmire
Pryor
Randolph
Riegle
Sarbanes
Sasser
Stennis
Tsongas
Zorinsky

Republicans
(11 or 20%)

Andrews
Chafee
East
Hatfield
Helms
Humphrey
Mathias
Nickles
Packwood
Stafford
Weicker

NOT VOTING (0)

ANALYSIS OF ISSUE VOTED ON:

Party Cohesion

Democrats— 100%
Republicans— 80%

Measure of Party Support on Issue as Voted on

For (43)
Democrats— 0 or 0%
Republicans— 43 or 100%

Against (57)
Democrats— 46 or 81%
Republicans— 11 or 19%

Prepared and Compiled by Senate Democratic Policy Committee
Robert C. Byrd, Chairman

SENATE VOTING RECORD

NO. 109

98th Congress
1st Session

May 19, 1983, 10:29 p.m.
Temp. Cong. Rec. p. S-7120

FIRST BUDGET RESOLUTION, 1984

BILL NO.: S. Con. Res. 27 (H. Con. Res. 91)

AMENDMENT NO.: 1290

SUBJECT: **Kennedy motion to table the Dole amendment (to the Gorton-Weicker, et al, substitute amendment—Vote Nos. 103 and 108) to insert the House-passed resolution, in its entirety, which provides a 2.8 percent real growth rate in defense spending in FY 1984, a revenue increase of $30 billion in FY 1984, and domestic spending of $11 billion above the Senate resolution.**

NOTE: Sponsors of the amendment (who did not support its content) stated they had brought the House bill to the floor to force a vote which they hoped would show strong opposition to the House plan containing higher domestic spending levels, increased revenues, and defense spending growth of 2.8 percent. Such a vote would be especially useful for budget conferees, some argued. Others contended that the work of the Senate, which would produce lower spending and deficits, was more realistic than the House measure and more likely to lead to a budget resolution that could be adopted.

S. Con. Res. 27 (H. Con. Res. 91): Vote Nos. 66-86, 102-112, 171, 172.

RESULT: **MOTION TO TABLE AGREED TO**

YEAS (54)

Democrats
(46 or 100%)

Baucus
Bentsen
Biden
Bingaman
Boren
Bradley
Bumpers
Burdick
Byrd
Chiles
Cranston
DeConcini
Dixon
Dodd
Eagleton
Exon
Ford
Glenn
Hart
Heflin
Hollings
Huddleston
Inouye
Jackson
Johnston
Kennedy
Lautenberg
Leahy
Levin
Long
Matsunaga
Melcher
Metzenbaum
Mitchell
Moynihan
Nunn
Pell
Proxmire
Pryor
Randolph
Riegle
Sarbanes
Sasser
Stennis
Tsongas
Zorinsky

Republicans
(8 or 15%)

Boschwitz
Chafee
Gorton
Hatfield
Mathias
Packwood
Stafford
Weicker

NAYS (46)

Democrats
(0 or 0%)

Republicans
(46 or 85%)

Abdnor
Andrews
Armstrong
Baker
Cochran
Cohen
D'Amato
Danforth
Denton
Dole
Domenici
Durenberger
East
Garn
Goldwater
Grassley
Hatch
Hawkins
Hecht
Heinz
Helms
Humphrey
Jepsen
Kassebaum
Kasten
Laxalt
Lugar
Mattingly
McClure
Murkowski
Nickles
Percy
Pressler
Quayle
Roth
Rudman
Simpson
Specter
Stevens
Symms
Thurmond
Tower
Trible
Wallop
Warner
Wilson

NOT VOTING (0)

ANALYSIS OF ISSUE VOTED ON:

Party Cohesion

Democrats— 100%
Republicans— 85%

Measure of Party Support on Issue as Voted on

For (54)
Democrats— 46 or 85%
Republicans— 8 or 15%

Against (46)
Democrats— 0 or 0%
Republicans— 46 or 100%

Prepared and Compiled by Senate Democratic Policy Committee
Robert C. Byrd, Chairman

SENATE VOTING RECORD

NO. 113

98th Congress
1st Session

May 24. 1983. 5:17 p.m.
Temp. Cong. Rec. p. S-7330

MX BASING APPROVAL

BILL NO.: S. Con. Res. 26

SUBJECT: **Baker motion to table the Dixon motion to postpone consideration of the resolution until the President submits a report to Congress (when the Senate is in session) proposing and containing plans for a basing mode for the MX missile that is either deceptive or mobile.**

NOTE: Proponents of postponing (voting nay) contended that the resolution would approve the worst possible basing mode that had been rejected last year. While supporting MX, they opposed the Scowcroft Commission recommendation that they be placed in vulnerable silos and urged reconsideration of the basing problem and submission of a new recommendation for a basing mode that would provide for mobile or deceptive basing. Others opposing the MX cited its threat to peace and the very survival of mankind, as well as its enormous cost of $20 to $30 billion. It makes no sense to build a vulnerable, first strike new missile and describe it as a device to enhance arms control. A smaller mobile missile with a single warhead is the sensible alternative to bolster America's deterrence, some argued.

Opponents of the motion who favored the Minuteman basing mode recommended by the Scowcroft Commission contended that Congressional rejection would risk compounding the difficulties the U.S. must face in deterrent modernization and at the bargaining table. The MX's ability to hold Soviet hardened targets at risk makes it a valuable incentive to move the USSR to realistic arms control. Others stated their support was dependent on a commitment to a mutual guaranteed builddown of nuclear forces between the U.S. and USSR. While supporting this resolution to allow flight testing and full-scale engineering development of the basing mode for the MX, they pointed out that other important milestones which will determine the fate of the MX would come up again and their continued support for MX would depend on what the Administration had accomplished toward arms control and a builddown.

S. Con. Res. 26: Vote Nos. 113. 114.

RESULT: **MOTION TO TABLE AGREED TO**

ADMINISTRATION POSITION: YEA

YEAS (59)

Democrats
(8 or 19%)

Bentsen
Boren
Heflin
Jackson
Johnston
Nunn
Stennis
Zorinsky

Republicans
(51 or 98%)

Abdnor
Andrews
Armstrong
Baker
Boschwitz
Chafee
Cochran
Cohen
Danforth
Denton
Dole
Domenici
Durenberger
East
Garn
Goldwater
Gorton
Grassley
Hatch
Hawkins
Hecht
Heinz
Helms
Humphrey
Jepsen
Kassebaum
Kasten
Laxalt
Lugar
Mathias
Mattingly
McClure
Murkowski
Nickles
Percy
Pressler
Quayle
Roth
Rudman
Simpson
Specter
Stafford
Stevens
Symms
Thurmond
Tower
Trible
Wallop
Warner
Weicker
Wilson

NAYS (35)

Democrats
(34 or 81%)

Baucus
Biden
Bingaman
Bradley
Bumpers
Burdick
Byrd
Chiles
Cranston
DeConcini
Dixon
Eagleton
Exon
Glenn
Hart
Hollings
Huddleston
Inouye
Kennedy
Lautenberg
Leahy
Levin
Long
Matsunaga
Melcher
Metzenbaum
Mitchell
Moynihan
Pell
Proxmire
Pryor
Riegle
Sarbanes
Sasser

Republicans
(1 or 2%)

Hatfield

NOT VOTING (5)

Democrats (3)

Dodd—^{2AN}
Randolph—^{2PY}
Tsongas—^{2}

Republicans (2)

D'Amato—^{2}
Packwood—^{2}

LIVE PAIRS (1)

PRESENT AND GIVING:	RECEIVING:
Ford (PN)	Randolph (PY)

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

1—Official Business
2—Necessarily Absent
3—Illness
4—Other

SYMBOLS:

AY—Announced Yea
AN—Announced Nay
PY—Paired Yea
PN—Paired Nay

ANALYSIS OF ISSUE VOTED ON:

Party Cohesion	Measure of Party Support on Issue as Voted on *For* (59)	 *Against* (35)
Democrats— 81%	Democrats— 8 or 14%	Democrats— 34 or 97%
Republicans— 98%	Republicans— 51 or 86%	Republicans— 1 or 3%

Prepared and Compiled by Senate Democratic Policy Committee
Robert C. Byrd. Chairman

SENATE VOTING RECORD

NO. 114

98th Congress
1st Session

May 25, 1983, 1:46 p.m.
Temp. Cong. Rec. p. S-7488

MX BASING APPROVAL

BILL NO.: S. Con. Res. 26

SUBJECT: **Adoption of the resolution approving the obligation and expenditure of funds appropriated in the FY 1983 Continuing Resolution, P.L. 97-377, for MX missile procurement and full-scale engineering development of a basing mode ($560 million is appropriated for full-scale engineering development and $65 million for flight testing).** (See Vote Nos. 423 and 424, 97th-2d.)

NOTE: H. Con. Res. 113, the House companion approval resolution, was agreed to by the House on May 24, by a vote of 239 to 186.

S. Con. Res. 26: Vote Nos. 113, 114.

RESULT: CONCURRENT RESOLUTION AGREED TO

ADMINISTRATION POSITION: YEA

YEAS (59)

Democrats (12 or 27%)

Bentsen
Byrd
Chiles
DeConcini
Heflin
Jackson
Johnston
Long
Nunn
Randolph
Stennis
Zorinsky

Republicans (47 or 89%)

Abdnor
Baker
Boschwitz
Chafee
Cochran
Cohen
D'Amato
Danforth
Denton
Dole
Domenici
East
Garn
Goldwater
Gorton
Grassley
Hatch
Hawkins
Hecht
Heinz
Helms
Jepsen
Kassebaum
Kasten
Laxalt
Lugar
Mathias
Mattingly
McClure
Murkowski
Nickles
Packwood
Percy
Pressler
Quayle
Roth
Rudman
Simpson
Specter
Stevens
Symms
Thurmond
Tower
Trible
Wallop
Warner
Wilson

NAYS (39)

Democrats (33 or 73%)

Baucus
Biden
Bingaman
Boren
Bradley
Bumpers
Burdick
Cranston
Dixon
Dodd
Eagleton
Exon
Ford
Glenn
Hart
Huddleston
Inouye
Kennedy
Lautenberg
Leahy
Levin
Matsunaga
Melcher
Metzenbaum
Mitchell
Moynihan
Pell
Proxmire
Pryor
Riegle
Sarbanes
Sasser
Tsongas

Republicans (6 or 11%)

Andrews
Durenberger
Hatfield
Humphrey
Stafford
Weicker

NOT VOTING (2)

Democrats (1)

Hollings—2

Republicans (1)

Armstrong—2AY

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

1—Official Business
2—Necessarily Absent
3—Illness
4—Other

SYMBOLS:

AY—Announced Yea
AN—Announced Nay
PY—Paired Yea
PN—Paired Nay

ANALYSIS OF ISSUE VOTED ON:

Party Cohesion	Measure of Party Support on Issue as Voted on *For* (59)	*Against* (39)
Democrats—73%	Democrats—12 or 20%	Democrats—33 or 85%
Republicans—89%	Republicans—47 or 80%	Republicans—6 or 15%

Prepared and Compiled by Senate Democratic Policy Committee
Robert C. Byrd, Chairman

SENATE VOTING RECORD

NO. 115

98th Congress
1st Session

May 25, 1983. 6:43 p.m.
Temp. Cong. Rec. p. S-7505

PUBLIC DEBT LIMIT—PERMANENT INCREASE

BILL NO.: H.R. 2990

SUBJECT: **Passage of the joint resolution which increases the debt limit by $98.8 billion over the present combined limit of $1.2902 trillion (consisting of a $400 billion permanent level and a $1.2502 trillion temporary level) for a total limit of $1.389 trillion and makes this level permanent; and increases, from $110 billion to $150 billion, the authority of the Treasury to issue bonds bearing interest rates above 4 1/2 percent.**

NOTE: The permanent debt level was last increased in 1972 when it was raised to $400 billion.

H.R. 2990 became Public Law 98-34, approved May 26, 1983.

H.R. 2990: Vote No. 115.

RESULT: **JOINT RESOLUTION PASSED**

ADMINISTRATION POSITION: YEA

YEAS (51)

Democrats (12 or 28%)

Bingaman
Bradley
Burdick
Dodd
Glenn
Jackson
Kennedy
Levin
Long
Matsunaga
Pell
Stennis

Republicans (39 or 80%)

Abdnor
Andrews
Baker
Boschwitz
Chafee
Cochran
Cohen
D'Amato
Danforth
Denton
Dole
Domenici
Garn
Goldwater
Gorton
Hatch
Hatfield
Hecht
Heinz
Kassebaum
Kasten
Laxalt
Lugar
Mathias
McClure
Murkowski
Percy
Pressler
Quayle
Roth
Rudman
Simpson
Specter
Stafford
Stevens
Thurmond
Wallop
Weicker
Wilson

NAYS (41)

Democrats (31 or 72%)

Baucus
Bentsen
Biden
Boren
Bumpers
Byrd
Chiles
Cranston
DeConcini
Dixon
Eagleton
Exon
Ford
Heflin
Inouye
Johnston
Lautenberg
Leahy
Melcher
Metzenbaum
Mitchell
Moynihan
Nunn
Proxmire
Pryor
Randolph
Riegle
Sarbanes
Sasser
Tsongas
Zorinsky

Republicans (10 or 20%)

East
Grassley
Helms
Humphrey
Jepsen
Mattingly
Nickles
Symms
Trible
Warner

NOT VOTING (8)

Democrats (3)

Hart—2
Hollings—2
Huddleston—2

Republicans (5)

Armstrong—2
Durenberger—2
Hawkins—2
Packwood—2
Tower—2

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

1—Official Business
2—Necessarily Absent
3—Illness
4—Other

SYMBOLS:

AY—Announced Yea
AN—Announced Nay
PY—Paired Yea
PN—Paired Nay

ANALYSIS OF ISSUE VOTED ON:

Party Cohesion

Democrats— 72%
Republicans— 80%

Measure of Party Support on Issue as Voted on

For (51)
Democrats— 12 or 24%
Republicans— 39 or 76%

Against (41)
Democrats— 31 or 76%
Republicans— 10 or 24%

Prepared and Compiled by Senate Democratic Policy Committee
Robert C. Byrd, Chairman

SENATE VOTING RECORD

NO. 131

98th Congress
1st Session

June 9, 1983, 4:43 p.m.
Temp. Cong. Rec. p. S-8067

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1983

BILL NO.: H.R. 3069

AMENDMENT NO.: 1332

TITLE: "Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1983."

SUBJECT: **Stevens amendment appropriating $185 million for multi-year Air Force procurement for the B-1 bomber, with funds to be available through September 30, 1985.**

NOTE: Proponents emphasized that this amendment would merely allow use of already appropriated funds for multiyear procurement (MYP) in order to achieve a savings of $800 million. The contracts will be reviewed by Congress and will not include any unfunded cancellation costs or financial penalty should Congress eliminate future MYP contracts for the B-1B. MYP is an essential component of the President's certification of the B-1B cost at $20.5 billion. As a result of certification, the President and the Defense Secretary have made personal commitments to keep the weapon's cost on budget. The B-1B is a proven design that has benefitted greatly from the initial B-1 testing and production and the component work which continued after production was cancelled by President Carter. Given the extensive development already accomplished, the limited nature of the remaining development, and the priority given the B-1B, this program clearly satisfies multi-year contracting criteria.

Opponents noted that the House Appropriations Committee provided no funds for MYP because the B-1B fails to meet the statutory requirement of stability of design with a fixed and determined cost. In the first instance, the B-1B has never been flown and requires redesign of at least 20 percent of the airframe, 30 percent of the offensive radar, and 40 percent of the defensive avionics. The Air Force's own cost analysis improvement group has projected a program cost of $26.8 billion, not the $20.5 billion which the President has certified. GAO also has found costs not included in the President's certification and has questioned the methodology used to compute the claimed savings from MYP. MYP, therefore, could leave Congress with a choice between continuing a program with unacceptable cost overruns or incurring unpalatable cancellation costs. Some favored elimination of the B-1B in favor of the Stealth bomber.

H.R. 3069: Vote Nos. 127-134, 138-140, 144-153, 238, 239.

RESULT: AMENDMENT AGREED TO

ADMINISTRATION POSITION: YEA

YEAS (52)

Democrats (10 or 25%)

Bentsen
Boren
Dixon
Exon
Heflin
Long
Metzenbaum
Randolph
Sasser
Zorinsky

Republicans (42 or 84%)

Abdnor
Andrews
Armstrong
Baker
Cochran
Cohen
D'Amato
Denton
Dole
Domenici
Durenberger
East
Gorton
Hatch
Hecht
Helms
Humphrey
Jepsen
Kasten
Laxalt
Lugar
Mathias
Mattingly
Murkowski
Nickles
Packwood
Percy
Quayle
Roth
Rudman
Simpson
Specter
Stafford
Stevens
Symms
Thurmond
Tower
Trible
Wallop
Warner
Weicker
Wilson

NAYS (38)

Democrats (30 or 75%)

Baucus
Biden
Bradley
Bumpers
Burdick
Byrd
Chiles
Dodd
Eagleton
Ford
Hollings
Huddleston
Jackson
Johnston
Kennedy
Lautenberg
Leahy
Levin
Matsunaga
Melcher
Mitchell
Moynihan
Nunn
Pell
Proxmire
Pryor
Riegle
Sarbanes
Stennis
Tsongas

Republicans (8 or 16%)

Chafee
Danforth
Grassley
Hatfield
Hawkins
Heinz
Kassebaum
Pressler

NOT VOTING (10)

Democrats (6)

Bingaman—^{2AN}
Cranston—^{2}
DeConcini—^{2}
Glenn—^{2AY}
Hart—^{2}
Inouye—^{2}

Republicans (4)

Boschwitz—^{2}
Garn—^{2}
Goldwater—^{2}
McClure—^{2}

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

1—Official Business
2—Necessarily Absent
3—Illness
4—Other

SYMBOLS:

AY—Announced Yea
AN—Announced Nay
PY—Paired Yea
PN—Paired Nay

ANALYSIS OF ISSUE VOTED ON:

Party Cohesion

Democrats— 75%
Republicans— 84%

Measure of Party Support on Issue as Voted on

For (52)
Democrats— 10 or 19%
Republicans— 42 or 81%

Against (38)
Democrats— 30 or 79%
Republicans— 8 or 21%

Prepared and Compiled by Senate Democratic Policy Committee
Robert C. Byrd, Chairman

SENATE VOTING RECORD

NO. 132

98th Congress
1st Session

June 9, 1983, 7:00 p.m.
Temp. Cong. Rec. p. S-8097

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1983

BILL NO.: H.R. 3069 **AMENDMENT NO.:** 1345

TITLE: "Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1983."

SUBJECT: **Leahy amendment reducing foreign aid by $376 million by cutting $22 million from the Economic Support Fund (leaving the $150 million for Lebanon unchanged), $144.7 million from the Military Assistance Program, and $240 million from loan guarantees under Foreign Military Credit Sales (leaving the $150 million for Lebanon unchanged).**

NOTE: Proponents noted that adoption of this modest cut from the amount reported would allow a $500 million increase for foreign aid appropriations and a total of $11.5 billion for the year. Reductions are especially important to lower the Federal deficit and to avoid a veto of a bill $600 million over the President's request. Most non-defense spending categories have been cut in recent years while foreign aid expenditures have increased 36 percent over the past two years. Much of the funds under consideration, except for Lebanon, are restatements of the Administration requests that were denied under regular appropriations. The conference report on the 1983 continuing resolution stated that, "...During these times of constraint of the domestic budget, high deficits, and budgetary limitations, the conferees cannot recommend higher levels...any supplemental request must be in response to serious emergency needs. A simple rerequesting of those items which the conferees have not provided...will not be considered genuine needs resulting from foreign policy problems." Some expressed concerns about the trend towards emphasizing military aid over economic aid which this bill would continue.

Opponents asserted that the foreign aid funds provided were consistent with the 1983 conference report. The committee, they noted, has already reduced the President's aid request by $190,350,000. The bill contains funds intended for the Central American region, Thailand (which has seen a build-up of potentially hostile troops on its border), Pakistan (which continues to suffer hostile actions and a related refugee problem on its border with Afghanistan), and Morocco (funds for which were appropriated earlier but reprogrammed for El Salvador). This amendment could jeopardize these and other important initiatives as well as our basic commitments to allies such as Israel, Egypt, Turkey, and Greece.

H.R. 3069: Vote Nos. 127-134, 138-140, 144-153, 238, 239.

RESULT: AMENDMENT REJECTED

YEAS (39)

Democrats (32 or 89%)

Baucus
Bentsen
Biden
Boren
Burdick
Byrd
Chiles
Dixon
Dodd
Eagleton
Exon
Ford
Heflin
Hollings
Huddleston
Kennedy
Lautenberg
Leahy
Levin
Melcher
Metzenbaum
Mitchell
Moynihan
Nunn
Pell
Proxmire
Randolph
Riegle
Sarbanes
Sasser
Stennis
Zorinsky

Republicans (7 or 15%)

Andrews
Durenberger
Grassley
Hatfield
Humphrey
Pressler
Weicker

NAYS (45)

Democrats (4 or 11%)

Bradley
Jackson
Matsunaga
Tsongas

Republicans (41 or 85%)

Abdnor
Armstrong
Baker
Chafee
Cochran
Cohen
D'Amato
Danforth
Denton
Dole
Domenici
East
Gorton
Hatch
Hawkins
Hecht
Heinz
Helms
Jepsen
Kassebaum
Kasten
Laxalt
Lugar
Mathias
Mattingly
Murkowski
Nickles
Percy
Quayle
Roth
Rudman
Simpson
Specter
Stevens
Symms
Thurmond
Tower
Trible
Wallop
Warner
Wilson

NOT VOTING (16)

Democrats (10)

Bingaman—2AY
Bumpers—2
Cranston—2
DeConcini—2
Glenn—2
Hart—2
Inouye—2
Johnston—2
Long—2
Pryor—2

Republicans (6)

Boschwitz—2
Garn—2
Goldwater—2
McClure—2
Packwood—2
Stafford—2

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

1—Official Business
2—Necessarily Absent
3—Illness

SYMBOLS:

AY—Announced Yea
AN—Announced Nay

ANALYSIS OF ISSUE VOTED ON:

Party Cohesion

Democrats—89%
Republicans—85%

Measure of Party Support on Issue as Voted on

For (39)
Democrats—32 or 82%
Republicans—7 or 18%

Against (45)
Democrats—4 or 9%
Republicans—41 or 91%

Prepared and Compiled by Senate Democratic Policy Committee
Robert C. Byrd, Chairman

SENATE VOTING RECORD

NO. 133

98th Congress
1st Session

June 9, 1983, 8:23 p.m.
Temp. Cong. Rec. p. S-8110

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1983

BILL NO.: H.R. 3069 AMENDMENT NO.: 1308

TITLE: "Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1983."

SUBJECT: **Kennedy-Hollings-Pell, et al, amendment appropriating $500,000 for a National Summit Conference on Education, to be held within 90 days, to develop and report to the President, Congress, and the States by January 15, 1984, specific recommendations for action with respect to the findings of the National Commission on Excellence in Education relating to student achievement, discipline, teacher quality and pay, curriculum, and the roles of the Federal, State, and local governments.**

NOTE: Proponents noted that recent reports, such as A Nation at Risk by the National Commission on Excellence in Education, accurately identified the problems facing public education but failed to provide an outline to remedy these failings. An education summit, which would include individuals of varied experience and interest in the field of education, could affect a broadly based review to develop the blueprint needed to implement the Commission's recommendations. The amendment has been endorsed by the Nation's most important education organizations, including the American Federation of Teachers, the National Education Association, the American Association of School Administrators, the National School Board Association, and the Chief State School Officers. The Commission has completed its work with the issuance of its final report. On-going studies cited by opponents, which are being done by the Department of Education, are too limited in scope and participation.

Opponents asserted that an education summit would be premature because the National Commission has not completed its work. An education summit would have great impact on public relations, opponents inferred, but would do little to improve education. The funds would be better spent on Federal education programs that would improve public education efforts directly, not on a duplicative study. Some expressed concern that the education summit would lead to establishing national education standards and further eroding of the role of local and State government in education.

H.R. 3069: Vote Nos. 127-134, 138-140, 144-153, 238, 239.

RESULT: AMENDMENT REJECTED

YEAS (38)			NAYS (48)			NOT VOTING (14)	
Democrats (36 or 97%)		Republicans (2 or 4%)	Democrats (1 or 3%)	Republicans (47 or 96%)		Democrats (9)	Republicans (5)
Baucus	Kennedy	Cohen	Proxmire	Abdnor	Kasten	Bingaman—2	Boschwitz—2
Bentsen	Lautenberg	Packwood		Andrews	Laxalt	Bumpers—2	Garn—2
Biden	Leahy			Armstrong	Lugar	Cranston—2	Goldwater—2
Boren	Levin			Baker	Mathias	DeConcini—2	McClure—2
Bradley	Long			Chafee	Mattingly	Hart—2	Wallop—2
Burdick	Matsunaga			Cochran	Murkowski	Inouye—2	
Byrd	Melcher			D'Amato	Nickles	Johnston—2	
Chiles	Metzenbaum			Danforth	Percy	Moynihan—2	
Dixon	Mitchell			Denton	Pressler	Pryor—2	
Dodd	Nunn			Dole	Quayle		
Eagleton	Pell			Domenici	Roth		
Exon	Randolph			Durenberger	Rudman		
Ford	Riegle			East	Simpson		
Glenn	Sarbanes			Gorton	Specter		
Heflin	Sasser			Grassley	Stafford		
Hollings	Stennis			Hatch	Stevens		
Huddleston	Tsongas			Hatfield	Symms		
Jackson	Zorinsky			Hawkins	Thurmond		
				Hecht	Tower		
				Heinz	Trible		
				Helms	Warner		
				Humphrey	Weicker		
				Jepsen	Wilson		
				Kassebaum			

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

1—Official Business
2—Necessarily Absent
3—Illness
4—Other

SYMBOLS:

AY—Announced Yea
AN—Announced Nay
PY—Paired Yea
PN—Paired Nay

ANALYSIS OF ISSUE VOTED ON:

Party Cohesion	Measure of Party Support on Issue as Voted on	
	For (38)	*Against* (48)
Democrats— 97%	Democrats— 36 or 95%	Democrats— 1 or 2%
Republicans— 96%	Republicans— 2 or 5%	Republicans— 47 or 98%

Prepared and Compiled by Senate Democratic Policy Committee
Robert C. Byrd, Chairman

SENATE VOTING RECORD

NO. 138

98th Congress
1st Session

June 14, 1983. 2:01 p.m.
Temp. Cong. Rec. p. S-8299

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1983

BILL NO.: H.R. 3069 **AMENDMENT NO.:** 1335

TITLE: "Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1983."

SUBJECT: **Bumpers-Jackson amendment (as a substitute for the Committee amendment) establishing a temporary moratorium on coal leasing until October 1, 1983, in order for the Bureau of Land Management to develop criteria for determining the "fair market value" of coal leases according to the law and the GAO.**

NOTE: Proponents contended that a moratorium would allow for reform of the current method of determining fair market value of Federal coal leases. A GAO study has shown that, contrary to applicable law, the sale of coal in the Powder River Basin yielded $100 million less than the fair market value. A four-month moratorium would have no effect on coal prices because current production exceeds demand by 100 million tons of coal. Furthermore, of the 616 Federal leases, only 111 are producing coal in spite of the fact that only five percent of existing Federal leases appear undevelopable. Emphasizing that this amendment would not lead to a moratorium similar to that of the 1970's, proponents asserted that immediate reform is vital since the Department intends to lease an additional 18 billion tons of coal in an already glutted coal market.

Opponents asserted that Federal coal leasing cannot be stopped and started because expert administrative personnel will be transferred to other activities. The amendment could precipitate another leasing moratorium similar to the 1970's which caused the high price of coal to American consumers. In the case of the Powder River Basin sale, the market value of coal lands in the region in 1983 dropped to about 50 percent due to the recession and the resumption of Federal leasing. Since the taxpayer ultimately pays for the coal through power bills, lower coal costs saved the public hundreds of dollars. The current coal market situation is not relevant to leasing plans because coal leased today will not be sold for another decade. A moratorium would mean little new western coal will be available since the Federal government controls 60 percent of western coal directly and an additional 20 percent indirectly.

H.R. 3069: Vote Nos. 127-134, 138-140, 144-153, 238, 239.

RESULT: **AMENDMENT REJECTED** ADMINISTRATION POSITION: NAY

YEAS (48)

Democrats (38 or 84%)

Baucus
Bentsen
Biden
Bingaman
Bradley
Bumpers
Byrd
Chiles
Cranston
DeConcini
Dixon
Dodd
Eagleton
Ford
Hart
Hollings
Huddleston
Inouye
Jackson
Kennedy
Lautenberg
Leahy
Levin
Long
Matsunaga
Melcher
Metzenbaum
Mitchell
Moynihan
Nunn
Pell
Proxmire
Pryor
Randolph
Riegle
Sarbanes
Stennis
Tsongas

Republicans (10 or 19%)

Boschwitz
Cohen
Durenberger
Humphrey
Kassebaum
Packwood
Percy
Roth
Stafford
Warner

NAYS (51)

Democrats (7 or 16%)

Boren
Burdick
Exon
Heflin
Johnston
Sasser
Zorinsky

Republicans (44 or 81%)

Abdnor
Andrews
Armstrong
Baker
Chafee
Cochran
D'Amato
Danforth
Denton
Dole
Domenici
East
Garn
Goldwater
Gorton
Grassley
Hatch
Hatfield
Hawkins
Hecht
Heinz
Helms
Jepsen
Kasten
Laxalt
Lugar
Mathias
Mattingly
McClure
Murkowski
Nickles
Pressler
Quayle
Rudman
Simpson
Specter
Stevens
Symms
Thurmond
Tower
Trible
Wallop
Weicker
Wilson

NOT VOTING (1)

Democrats (1) **Republicans (0)**

Glenn—2

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

1—Official Business
2—Necessarily Absent
3—Illness
4—Other

SYMBOLS:

AY—Announced Yea
AN—Announced Nay
PY—Paired Yea
PN—Paired Nay

ANALYSIS OF ISSUE VOTED ON:

Party Cohesion	Measure of Party Support on Issue as Voted on	
	For (48)	*Against* (51)
Democrats— 84%	Democrats— 38 or 79%	Democrats— 7 or 14%
Republicans— 81%	Republicans— 10 or 21%	Republicans— 44 or 86%

Prepared and Compiled by Senate Democratic Policy Committee
Robert C. Byrd, Chairman

SENATE VOTING RECORD

NO. 140

98th Congress
1st Session

June 14, 1983, 3:08 p.m.
Temp. Cong. Rec. p. S-8303

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1983

BILL NO.: H.R. 3069 **AMENDMENT NO.:** 1360

TITLE: "Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1983."

SUBJECT: **Cohen motion to table the Metzenbaum amendment prohibiting the use of funds by the Navy under future contracts to indemnify the lessor of a ship to the Navy for tax deductions denied by the IRS or for the payment of the lessor's attorney fees in connection with his appeal of the IRS decision.** (Subsequently, the amendment was agreed to by voice vote.)

NOTE: Proponents contended that the amendment would prevent current abuses that effectively allow the Navy to circumvent the regular authorization and appropriation process and obligate the U.S. to pay the legal expenses of contractors who contest any IRS ruling disallowing tax benefits gained through leasing ships to the Navy. Worse, if the lessor's tax-paid legal efforts fail, the contracts provide that the Navy will pay any tax incurred. This questionable practice is not even the cheapest method to obtain needed cargo ships because these leases could cost $415 million per ship in direct leasing costs and foregone taxes while the ships could be purchased for $178 million. Both tax writing committees of Congress have begun consideration of legislation to curb the use of leasing as a tax mechanism for State and local governments and nonprofit entities to finance activities through the Federal Treasury. This amendment would not affect current contracts but would prevent future unreasonable indemnification. Regardless of the merits of acquiring more cargo ships, the Navy should have to request the ships through the regular authorization process.

Opponents expressed concerns that this amendment would require an additional $200 million in Budget Authority and Outlays. Others argued that the amendment was premature because several committees are studying this matter in preparation of appropriate action in the regular legislative process.

H.R. 3069: Vote Nos. 127-134, 138-140, 144-153, 238, 239.

RESULT: MOTION TO TABLE DEFEATED

YEAS (49)

Democrats (8 or 18%)

Cranston
Inouye
Mitchell
Pell
Pryor
Sarbanes
Stennis
Tsongas

Republicans (41 or 76%)

Abdnor
Andrews
Boschwitz
Chafee
Cochran
Cohen
D'Amato
Denton
East
Garn
Goldwater
Gorton
Hatch
Hatfield
Hawkins
Hecht
Helms
Humphrey
Jepsen
Kassebaum
Kasten
Laxalt
Lugar
Mathias
Mattingly
McClure
Murkowski
Packwood
Quayle
Rudman
Simpson
Stafford
Stevens
Symms
Thurmond
Tower
Trible
Wallop
Warner
Weicker
Wilson

NAYS (50)

Democrats (37 or 82%)

Baucus
Bentsen
Biden
Bingaman
Boren
Bradley
Bumpers
Burdick
Byrd
Chiles
DeConcini
Dixon
Dodd
Eagleton
Exon
Ford
Glenn
Hart
Heflin
Hollings
Huddleston
Jackson
Johnston
Kennedy
Lautenberg
Leahy
Levin
Matsunaga
Melcher
Metzenbaum
Moynihan
Nunn
Proxmire
Randolph
Riegle
Sasser
Zorinsky

Republicans (13 or 24%)

Armstrong
Baker
Danforth
Dole
Domenici
Durenberger
Grassley
Heinz
Nickles
Percy
Pressler
Roth
Specter

NOT VOTING (1)

Democrats (1)

Long—2

Republicans (0)

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

1—Official Business
2—Necessarily Absent
3—Illness
4—Other

SYMBOLS:

AY—Announced Yea
AN—Announced Nay
PY—Paired Yea
PN—Paired Nay

ANALYSIS OF ISSUE VOTED ON:

Party Cohesion	Measure of Party Support on Issue as Voted on *For* (49)	 *Against* (50)
Democrats— 82%	Democrats— 8 or 16%	Democrats— 37 or 74%
Republicans— 76%	Republicans— 41 or 84%	Republicans— 13 or 26%

Prepared and Compiled by Senate Democratic Policy Committee
Robert C. Byrd, Chairman

SENATE VOTING RECORD

NO. 154

98th Congress
1st Session

June 16, 1983, 3:48 p.m.
Temp. Cong. Rec. p. S-8558

INTEREST AND DIVIDEND WITHHOLDING REPEAL/CARIBBEAN BASIN INITIATIVE

BILL NO.: H.R. 2973

AMENDMENT NO.: 1412

SUBJECT: **Long motion to table the Dole committee substitute amendment, as amended, which repeals the 10 percent withholding requirement on interest and dividend income and substitutes improved information reporting and backup withholding for those who have failed to report interest income; includes, with modifications, the President's Caribbean Basin initiative and urban enterprise zones; contains the provisions of S. 144, the Trade Reciprocity bill, as passed by the Senate; and deletes the December 31, 1983, expiration date for mortgage revenue bonds.** (See also Vote Nos. 27, 36-38, 57-62, 155, and 156, 98th-1st, and Vote No. 247, 97th-2d.)

NOTE: Proponents of the amendment asserted that adopting the more stringent income reporting requirements would improve taxpayer compliance and partially recover the revenue foregone as a result of repealing withholding. Improved compliance, combined with the several priority legislative initiatives contained in the amendment, could induce the President to sign the bill in spite of his support for withholding. The Treasury Department has indicated it will provide a 30-day extension for undue hardship beyond the July 1 effective date of withholding to all payors of interest and dividends, allowing time to resolve in conference the considerable differences between the House- and Senate-passed bill.

Opponents of the amendment supported passage of the House bill without amendment in order to assure repeal of withholding before its effective date. Addition of the unrelated measures, in the form of the pending Committee substitute, threatens to prolong consideration of repeal and thwart the will of both Houses of Congress and the American people. They criticized "backup" withholding because it would: (1) affect millions of bank accounts with missing identification numbers; (2) require massive additional funds for enforcement; (3) stigmatize innocent taxpayers through IRS notices instructing banks and corporations to begin withholding; (4) require new sworn tax statements related to the accuracy of identification numbers; (5) create a complex series of new requirements and penalties for brokers and publicly traded corporations related to withholding; and (6) fail to provide the IRS with the normal authority to waive new penalties on banks and corporations for reasonable cause.

H.R. 2973: Vote Nos. 154-157, 234.

RESULT: MOTION TO TABLE DEFEATED

YEAS (46)

Democrats (43 or 100%)

Baucus
Bentsen
Biden
Bingaman
Boren
Bradley
Bumpers
Burdick
Byrd
Chiles
DeConcini
Dixon
Dodd
Eagleton
Exon
Ford
Glenn
Hart
Heflin
Hollings
Huddleston
Jackson
Johnston
Kennedy
Lautenberg
Leahy
Levin
Long
Matsunaga
Melcher
Metzenbaum
Mitchell
Moynihan
Nunn
Pell
Proxmire
Pryor
Randolph
Riegle
Sarbanes
Stennis
Tsongas
Zorinsky

Republicans (3 or 6%)

Goldwater
Hawkins
Weicker

NAYS (51)

Democrats (0 or 0%)

Republicans (51 or 94%)

Abdnor
Andrews
Armstrong
Baker
Boschwitz
Chafee
Cochran
Cohen
D'Amato
Danforth
Denton
Dole
Domenici
Durenberger
East
Garn
Gorton
Grassley
Hatch
Hatfield
Hecht
Heinz
Helms
Humphrey
Jepsen
Kassebaum
Kasten
Laxalt
Lugar
Mathias
Mattingly
McClure
Murkowski
Nickles
Packwood
Percy
Pressler
Quayle
Roth
Rudman
Simpson
Specter
Stafford
Stevens
Symms
Thurmond
Tower
Trible
Wallop
Warner
Wilson

NOT VOTING (3)

Democrats (3)

Cranston—2
Inouye—2
Sasser—3AY †

Republicans (0)

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

1—Official Business
2—Necessarily Absent
3—Illness
4—Other

SYMBOLS:

AY—Announced Yea
AN—Announced Nay
PY—Paired Yea
PN—Paired Nay

† Perm. Rec. correction—CRS-8926/7, June 22, 1983

ANALYSIS OF ISSUE VOTED ON:

Party Cohesion

Democrats— 100%
Republicans— 94%

Measure of Party Support on Issue as Voted on

For (46)
Democrats— 43 or 93%
Republicans— 3 or 7%

Against (51)
Democrats— 0 or 0%
Republicans— 51 or 100%

Prepared and Compiled by Senate Democratic Policy Committee
Robert C. Byrd, Chairman

SENATE VOTING RECORD

NO. 155

98th Congress
1st Session

June 16, 1983, 6:26 p.m.
Temp. Cong. Rec. p. S-8572

INTEREST AND DIVIDEND WITHHOLDING REPEAL/CARIBBEAN BASIN INITIATIVE

BILL NO.: H.R. 2973 **AMENDMENT NO.:** 1417

SUBJECT: **Baker motion to table the Pryor amendment (to the Dole Committee substitute) striking all provisions except the repeal of withholding on interest and dividend income.** (See also Vote Nos. 27, 36-38, 57-62, 154, and 156, 98th-1st, and Vote No. 247, 97th-2d.)

NOTE: Proponents of the amendment expressed a desire for a direct vote in favor of the repeal of withholding well in advance of the effective date in order to prevent any unnecessary burden related to compliance. Addition of the unrelated measures, in the form of the pending Committee substitute, threatens to prolong consideration of repeal and thwart the will of both Houses of Congress and the American people as evidenced by the thousands of letters of opposition that withholding has generated. Regardless of their merits, consideration of the Enterprise Zone, Caribbean Basin, Trade Reciprocity, and Mortgage Revenue Bond bills should be delayed to a future date when their merits can be fully debated.

Opponents of the amendment asserted that adopting the more stringent income reporting requirements would improve taxpayer compliance and partially recover the revenue foregone as a result of repealing withholding. Improved compliance, combined with the several priority legislative initiatives contained in the amendment, could induce the President to sign the bill in spite of his support of withholding. Furthermore, the Constitution requires that revenue measures originate in the House. It is unlikely, they contended, that the Democratic House will afford the Republican Senate another vehicle for passage of these important tax and tariff initiatives. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, indicating that his Department would provide a one month extension beyond the July 1 effective date of withholding for undue hardship to all payors of interest and dividends, would allow time to resolve in conference the considerable differences between the House- and Senate-passed bills.

H.R. 2973: Vote Nos. 154-157, 234.

RESULT: MOTION TO TABLE AGREED TO

YEAS (50)			NAYS (40)			NOT VOTING (10)	
Democrats (2 or 5%)	**Republicans (48 or 100%)**		**Democrats (40 or 95%)**		**Republicans (0 or 0%)**	**Democrats (4)**	**Republicans (6)**
Moynihan	Abdnor	Kasten	Baucus	Jackson		Biden—^{2}	Boschwitz—^{2}
Pell	Andrews	Laxalt	Bentsen	Johnston		Cranston—^{2}	Denton—^{2}
	Armstrong	Lugar	Bingaman	Kennedy		Inouye—^{2}	Goldwater—^{2}
	Baker	Mattingly	Boren	Lautenberg		Sasser—^{3AY} †	Heinz—^{2AY}
	Chafee	McClure	Bradley	Leahy			Mathias—^{2}
	Cochran	Murkowski	Bumpers	Levin			Stafford—^{2}
	Cohen	Nickles	Burdick	Long			
	D'Amato	Packwood	Byrd	Matsunaga			
	Danforth	Percy	Chiles	Melcher			
	Dole	Pressler	DeConcini	Metzenbaum			
	Domenici	Quayle	Dixon	Mitchell			
	Durenberger	Roth	Dodd	Nunn			
	East	Rudman	Eagleton	Proxmire			
	Garn	Simpson	Exon	Pryor			
	Gorton	Specter	Ford	Randolph			
	Grassley	Stevens	Glenn	Riegle			
	Hatch	Symms	Hart	Sarbanes			
	Hatfield	Thurmond	Heflin	Stennis			
	Hawkins	Tower	Hollings	Tsongas			
	Hecht	Trible	Huddleston	Zorinsky			
	Helms	Wallop					
	Humphrey	Warner					
	Jepsen	Weicker					
	Kassebaum	Wilson					

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

1—Official Business
2—Necessarily Absent
3—Illness
4—Other

SYMBOLS:

AY—Announced Yea
AN—Announced Nay
PY—Paired Yea
PN—Paired Nay

† Perm. Rec. correction—CRS-8926/7, June 22, 1983

ANALYSIS OF ISSUE VOTED ON:

Party Cohesion	**Measure of Party Support on Issue as Voted on**	
	For (50)	*Against* (40)
Democrats— 95%	Democrats— 2 or 4%	Democrats— 40 or 100%
Republicans— 100%	Republicans— 48 or 96%	Republicans— 0 or 0%

Prepared and Compiled by Senate Democratic Policy Committee
Robert C. Byrd, Chairman

SENATE VOTING RECORD

NO. 156

98th Congress
1st Session

June 16, 1983, 6:56 p.m.
Temp. Cong. Rec. p. S-8580

INTEREST AND DIVIDEND WITHHHOLDING REPEAL/CARIBBEAN BASIN INITIATIVE

BILL NO.: H.R. 2973

AMENDMENT NO.: 1412

SUBJECT: **Dole committee substitute amendment, as amended, which repeals the 10 percent withholding requirement on interest and dividend income and substitutes improved information reporting and backup withholding for those who have failed to report interest income; includes, with modifications, the President's Caribbean Basin initiative and urban enterprise zones; contains the provisions of S. 144, the Trade Reciprocity bill, as passed by the Senate; and deletes the December 31, 1983, expiration date for mortgage revenue bonds.** (See Vote Nos. 27, 36-38, 57-62, 154, and 155, 98th-1st, and Vote No. 247, 97th-2d.)

NOTE: Proponents of the amendment asserted that adopting the more stringent income reporting requirements would improve taxpayer compliance and partially recover the revenue foregone as a result of repealing withholding. Improved compliance, combined with the several priority legislative initiatives contained in the amendment, could induce the President to sign the bill in spite of his support of withholding. Furthermore, the Constitution requires that revenue measures originate in the House. It is unlikely, they contended, that the Democratic House will afford the Republican Senate another vehicle for passage of these important tax and tariff initatives. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, indicating that his Department would provide a one month extension beyond the July 1 effective date of withholding for undue hardship to all payors of interest and dividends, would allow time to resolve in conference the considerable differences between the House- and Senate-passed bills.

Opponents of the amendment expressed a desire for a direct vote in favor of the repeal of withholding well in advance of its effective date in order to prevent any unnecessary burden related to compliance. Addition of the unrelated measures, in the form of the pending substitute, threatens to prolong consideration of repeal and thwart the will of both Houses of Congress and the American people as evidenced by the thousands of letters of opposition withholding has generated. Regardless of their merits, consideration of the Enterprise Zone, Caribbean Basin, Trade Reciprocity, and Mortgage Revenue Bond bills should be delayed to a future date when their merits can be fully debated.

H.R. 2973: Vote Nos. 154-157, 234.

RESULT: AMENDMENT AGREED TO

YEAS (48)

Democrats (1 or 2%)

Moynihan

Republicans (47 or 100%)

Abdnor
Andrews
Armstrong
Baker
Chafee
Cochran
Cohen
D'Amato
Danforth
Dole
Domenici
Durenberger
East
Garn
Gorton
Grassley
Hatch
Hatfield
Hawkins
Hecht
Humphrey
Jepsen
Kassebaum
Kasten
Laxalt
Lugar
Mattingly
McClure
Murkowski
Nickles
Packwood
Percy
Pressler
Quayle
Roth
Rudman
Simpson
Specter
Stevens
Symms
Thurmond
Tower
Trible
Wallop
Warner
Weicker
Wilson

NAYS (41)

Democrats (41 or 98%)

Baucus
Bentsen
Bingaman
Boren
Bradley
Bumpers
Burdick
Byrd
Chiles
DeConcini
Dixon
Dodd
Eagleton
Exon
Ford
Glenn
Hart
Heflin
Hollings
Huddleston
Jackson
Johnston
Kennedy
Lautenberg
Leahy
Levin
Long
Matsunaga
Melcher
Metzenbaum
Mitchell
Nunn
Pell
Proxmire
Pryor
Randolph
Riegle
Sarbanes
Stennis
Tsongas
Zorinsky

Republicans (0 or 0%)

NOT VOTING (11)

Democrats (4)

Biden—2
Cranston—2
Inouye—2
Sasser—3AN †

Republicans (7)

Boschwitz—2AY
Denton—2
Goldwater—2
Heinz—2
Helms—2
Mathias—2
Stafford—2

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

1—Official Business
2—Necessarily Absent
3—Illness
4—Other

SYMBOLS:

AY—Announced Yea
AN—Announced Nay
PY—Paired Yea
PN—Paired Nay

† Perm. Rec. correction—CRS-8926/7, June 22, 1983

ANALYSIS OF ISSUE VOTED ON:

Party Cohesion	Measure of Party Support on Issue as Voted on	
	For (48)	*Against* (41)
Democrats— 98%	Democrats— 1 or 2%	Democrats— 41 or 100%
Republicans— 100%	Republicans— 47 or 98%	Republicans— 0 or 0%

Prepared and Compiled by Senate Democratic Policy Committee
Robert C. Byrd, Chairman

SENATE VOTING RECORD

NO. 165

98th Congress
1st Session

June 21, 1983, 6:27 p.m.
Temp. Cong. Rec. p. S-8821

HUD APPROPRIATIONS, 1984

BILL NO.: H.R. 3133 **AMENDMENT NO.:** 1428

TITLE: "Department of Housing and Urban Development-Independent Agencies Appropriations Act, 1984."

SUBJECT: **Garn motion to table the Heinz-Riegle amendment authorizing $500 million in loan guarantees for a mortgage relief program for unemployed homeowners.**

NOTE: Proponents of the amendment declared that Congress urgently needs to address the mortgage default problem of involuntarily unemployed homeowners. As of March 31, 1983, approximately 445,000 home loans were past due, according to the Mortgage Bankers Association of America, with 60,000 loans in foreclosure. This program has been targeted to areas with the highest mortgage delinquency rates to assure the maximum cost-efficiency and effectiveness of the program, and only mortgagors who have exhausted all other reasonable financial remedies would be eligible. It would be self-financing with all potential losses being covered by reserves accumulated from the loan guarantee fee, ensuring that the Federal deficit would not be increased. Existing personnel would handle its administration. In an attempt to overcome any reservations about the program, which enjoyed bipartisan support in the Banking Committee, its authorization period has been reduced from two years to one year, and the budget authority has been cut from $750 million to $500 million. The mortgage default problem deserves the immediate attention of the Senate and this amendment should not be defeated, proponents asserted, merely because its sponsors were forced to propose it to an appropriations bill because the housing authorization bill was laid aside indefinitely.

Opponents of the amendment pointed out that it was legislation on an appropriations bill and should be addressed properly in the housing authorization bill. The mortgage relief program, which increases outlays by $50 million in FY 1983 and $200 million in 1984, would create an objectionable negative budgetary impact. More than any other appropriations subcommittee, the HUD Subcommittee made a major contribution toward reducing the Federal deficit, and this necessary practice should be continued. Others stated that while they supported the amendment's goals, Congress should not risk putting "additional baggage" on this legislation which could be used as a reason for vetoing it.

H.R. 3133: Vote Nos. 165, 166, 175.

RESULT: MOTION TO TABLE AGREED TO.

YEAS (55)

Democrats (12 or 28%)

Bentsen
Chiles
Exon
Heflin
Huddleston
Johnston
Mitchell
Nunn
Proxmire
Pryor
Stennis
Zorinsky

Republicans (43 or 84%)

Abdnor
Andrews
Armstrong
Baker
Chafee
Cochran
Cohen
Denton
Dole
Domenici
Durenberger
East
Garn
Goldwater
Gorton
Grassley
Hatch
Hatfield
Hecht
Helms
Humphrey
Jepsen
Kassebaum
Kasten
Laxalt
Lugar
Mattingly
McClure
Murkowski
Nickles
Packwood
Percy
Roth
Rudman
Simpson
Stafford
Stevens
Symms
Thurmond
Tower
Wallop
Warner
Wilson

NAYS (39)

Democrats (31 or 72%)

Baucus
Biden
Bingaman
Boren
Bradley
Bumpers
Burdick
Byrd
Cranston
DeConcini
Dixon
Dodd
Eagleton
Ford
Hart
Inouye
Jackson
Kennedy
Lautenberg
Leahy
Levin
Matsunaga
Melcher
Metzenbaum
Moynihan
Pell
Randolph
Riegle
Sarbanes
Sasser
Tsongas

Republicans (8 or 16%)

Boschwitz
D'Amato
Hawkins
Heinz
Mathias
Specter
Trible
Weicker

NOT VOTING (6)

Democrats (3)

Glenn—2
Hollings—2
Long—2

Republicans (3)

Danforth—2
Pressler—2
Quayle—2

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

1—Official Business
2—Necessarily Absent
3—Illness
4—Other

SYMBOLS:

AY—Announced Yea
AN—Announced Nay
PY—Paired Yea
PN—Paired Nay

ANALYSIS OF ISSUE VOTED ON:

Party Cohesion	**Measure of Party Support on Issue as Voted on** *For* (55)	*Against* (39)
Democrats— 72%	Democrats— 12 or 22%	Democrats— 31 or 79%
Republicans— 84%	Republicans— 43 or 78%	Republicans— 8 or 21%

Prepared and Compiled by Senate Democratic Policy Committee
Robert C. Byrd, Chairman

SENATE VOTING RECORD

NO. 171

98th Congress
1st Session

June 23, 1983, 5:41 p.m.
Temp. Cong. Rec. p. S-8972

FIRST BUDGET RESOLUTION, 1984

BILL NO.: H. Con. Res. 91 (S. Con. Res. 27) AMENDMENT NO.: 1435

SUBJECT: **Dole amendment reducing the reconciled revenue figure from $73 billion to $59 billion in the aggregate over FY 1984-86 and changing the date by which the Finance Committee must report its revenue reconciliation legislation from July 22 to September 15, 1983.**

NOTE: Proponents stated that this amendment would allow a more balanced approach to deficit reduction by the Finance Committee, which must deal with 86 percent of the resolution package, to design a package with tax increases which hinge on spending reductions. A July 22 reporting date is unrealistic, they declared, and it is unfair to ask that the Committee raise $73 billion in revenues and to cut spending by only $1.7 billion. The September date would allow the Committee time to design a package of revenue raising measures which hinge on spending reductions, thereby achieving a deficit reduction that would have a marked impact on interest rates and help sustain the economic recovery. The $59 billion figure is an aggregate number which the President could support, they asserted, and the amendment is not offered to "kill" the budget resolution but in an effort to salvage it.

Opponents declared that they did not believe that the President would support $59 billion in reconciled revenues or that the economic impact of the amendment was markedly different from the increase in the conference agreement. If a modification is adopted at this late date, they added, Congress will not be able to pass the budget resolution.

H. Con. Res. 91 (S. Con. Res. 27): Vote Nos. 66-86, 102-112, 171, 172.

RESULT: AMENDMENT REJECTED

YEAS (41)

Democrats (7 or 16%)

Baucus
Boren
Exon
Long
Melcher
Nunn
Zorinsky

Republicans (34 or 69%)

Abdnor
Armstrong
Baker
Cochran
Cohen
D'Amato
Denton
Dole
Durenberger
East
Garn
Hatch
Hawkins
Hecht
Heinz
Helms
Humphrey
Jepsen
Kasten
Laxalt
Lugar
Mattingly
McClure
Nickles
Quayle
Roth
Rudman
Specter
Symms
Thurmond
Trible
Wallop
Warner
Wilson

NAYS (51)

Democrats (36 or 84%)

Bentsen
Biden
Bingaman
Bradley
Bumpers
Burdick
Byrd
Chiles
Cranston
DeConcini
Dixon
Dodd
Eagleton
Ford
Glenn
Heflin
Huddleston
Inouye
Jackson
Johnston
Kennedy
Lautenberg
Leahy
Levin
Matsunaga
Metzenbaum
Mitchell
Moynihan
Pell
Proxmire
Pryor
Randolph
Riegle
Sarbanes
Sasser
Stennis

Republicans (15 or 31%)

Andrews
Boschwitz
Chafee
Danforth
Domenici
Goldwater
Gorton
Hatfield
Kassebaum
Mathias
Packwood
Stafford
Stevens
Tower
Weicker

NOT VOTING (8)

Democrats (3)

Hart—2
Hollings—2
Tsongas—2

Republicans (5)

Grassley—2AY
Murkowski—2AY
Percy—2
Pressler—2
Simpson—2

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

1—Official Business
2—Necessarily Absent
3—Illness
4—Other

SYMBOLS:

AY—Announced Yea
AN—Announced Nay
PY—Paired Yea
PN—Paired Nay

ANALYSIS OF ISSUE VOTED ON:

Party Cohesion	**Measure of Party Support on Issue as Voted on**	
	For (41)	*Against* (51)
Democrats— 84%	Democrats— 7 or 17%	Democrats— 36 or 71%
Republicans— 69%	Republicans— 34 or 83%	Republicans— 15 or 29%

Prepared and Compiled by Senate Democratic Policy Committee
Robert C. Byrd, Chairman

SENATE VOTING RECORD

NO. 174

98th Congress
1st Session

June 29, 1983, 10:00 a.m.
Temp. Cong. Rec. p. S-9422

THIRD YEAR TAX CUT

BILL NO.: H.R. 1183

TITLE: "Tax Rate Equity Act of 1983."

SUBJECT: **Rejection of the bill which modifies the July 1983 individual tax rate reductions contained in the Economic Recovery Tax Act of 1981 (ERTA) to limit the maximum reduction available to taxpayers in 1984 to approximately $700 by altering the tax rate schedules for 1983, 1984, and subsequent years; includes a preamble expressing the sense of the Congress that in view of the threat posed to economic recovery by projected Federal deficits, the revenue gains resulting from enactment of this legislation should be applied to reducing Federal deficits and deficit projections; provides that the individual income tax changes be accompanied by a dollar-for-dollar reduction in FY 1984 outlays in an amount at least equal to the additional revenue to be collected; and specifies that no penalty for underpayment of estimated income tax will be imposed with respect to an underpayment for a taxable year beginning during 1983 to the extent that the underpayment results from the changes in tax rate schedules made by the bill.**

NOTE: The modifications would result in limits on the maximum cut for 1984 of $720 for married couples filing joint returns, $673 for unmarried heads of households, and $637 for other unmarried individuals. The limits for 1983 would be about half of the corresponding 1984 figures.

H.R. 1183: Vote No. 174.

RESULT: BILL DEFEATED

ADMINISTRATION POSITION: NAY

YEAS (45)

Democrats (42 or 91%)

Baucus
Bentsen
Biden
Bingaman
Bradley
Bumpers
Burdick
Byrd
Chiles
Cranston
DeConcini
Dixon
Dodd
Eagleton
Exon
Ford
Glenn
Hart
Hollings
Huddleston
Inouye
Jackson
Kennedy
Lautenberg
Leahy
Levin
Long
Matsunaga
Melcher
Metzenbaum
Mitchell
Moynihan
Nunn
Pell
Proxmire
Pryor
Randolph
Riegle
Sarbanes
Sasser
Stennis
Tsongas

Republicans (3 or 6%)

Cohen
Heinz
Specter

NAYS (55)

Democrats (4 or 9%)

Boren
Heflin
Johnston
Zorinsky

Republicans (51 or 94%)

Abdnor
Andrews
Armstrong
Baker
Boschwitz
Chafee
Cochran
D'Amato
Danforth
Denton
Dole
Domenici
Durenberger
East
Garn
Goldwater
Gorton
Grassley
Hatch
Hatfield
Hawkins
Hecht
Helms
Humphrey
Jepsen
Kassebaum
Kasten
Laxalt
Lugar
Mathias
Mattingly
McClure
Murkowski
Nickles
Packwood
Percy
Pressler
Quayle
Roth
Rudman
Simpson
Stafford
Stevens
Symms
Thurmond
Tower
Trible
Wallop
Warner
Weicker
Wilson

NOT VOTING (0)

ANALYSIS OF ISSUE VOTED ON:

Party Cohesion

Democrats— 91%
Republicans— 94%

Measure of Party Support on Issue as Voted on

For (45)
Democrats— 42 or 93%
Republicans— 3 or 7%

Against (55)
Democrats— 4 or 7%
Republicans— 51 or 93%

Prepared and Compiled by Senate Democratic Policy Committee
Robert C. Byrd, Chairman

SENATE VOTING RECORD

NO. 182

98th Congress
1st Session

July 12, 1983, 6:13 p.m.
Temp. Cong. Rec. p. S-9691

DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS

BILL NO.: S. 675

AMENDMENT NO.: 1462

TITLE: "Omnibus Defense Authorization Act, 1984."

SUBJECT: **Tower amendment permitting the expenditure of funds to build facilities to produce 155mm nuclear shells (neutron bombs) if the President approves this use and certifies to Congress that it is essential to national security, regardless of the requirement in the Energy-Water Appropriations (H.R. 3132) conference report that one NATO country must approve its deployment before construction can begin.** (See also Vote No. 188.)

NOTE: Proponents criticized language in the Energy-Water Appropriations bill, which is soon to become law, that would make construction of facilities to produce the 155mm shell contingent upon a NATO ally's agreement to deploy the weapon. That language allows a foreign power to decide whether or not the U.S. produces a weapon, regardless of a determination by the President, the Secretary of Defense, and the Joint Chiefs that production is in the national interest. A NATO ally would even be able to control production of the shell for use in non-NATO countries, such as Korea. This amendment would rectify that situation and shift the final decision on construction of production facilities to the President who is a much better judge of the needs of our armed forces. The 155mm will replace the aging models now in the inventory, some of which have had to be dismantled. The new shell, although similar to the current one, produces less collateral damage and incorporates new safety features. Because the 155mm shell is compatible with the most common NATO artillery piece, it would increase the number of allied nuclear firing platforms and, thus, enhance deterrence by complicating any Soviet attack.

(OVER)

S. 675: Vote Nos. 181-195, 197-221, 244, 244.

RESULT: **AMENDMENT AGREED TO**

YEAS (47)

Democrats (9 or 23%)

Bentsen
Byrd
Dixon
Exon
Ford
Heflin
Jackson
Nunn
Zorinsky

Republicans (38 or 76%)

Abdnor
Armstrong
Baker
Chafee
Cochran
Cohen
D'Amato
Denton
Dole
Domenici
East
Garn
Goldwater
Gorton
Grassley
Hatch
Hecht
Helms
Humphrey
Jepsen
Kassebaum
Kasten
Laxalt
Lugar
Mattingly
McClure
Nickles
Roth
Rudman
Simpson
Stafford
Stevens
Symms
Thurmond
Tower
Trible
Warner
Wilson

NAYS (42)

Democrats (30 or 77%)

Baucus
Biden
Bingaman
Boren
Bradley
Bumpers
Burdick
Chiles
Cranston
DeConcini
Dodd
Eagleton
Glenn
Huddleston
Inouye
Johnston
Lautenberg
Leahy
Levin
Matsunaga
Melcher
Metzenbaum
Mitchell
Moynihan
Proxmire
Pryor
Riegle
Sarbanes
Sasser
Tsongas

Republicans (12 or 24%)

Andrews
Boschwitz
Danforth
Durenberger
Hawkins
Heinz
Mathias
Packwood
Percy
Pressler
Specter
Weicker

NOT VOTING (11)

Democrats (7)

Hart—2
Hollings—2
Kennedy—2AN
Long—2
Pell—2AN
Randolph—3AN
Stennis—2

Republicans (4)

Hatfield—2AN
Murkowski—2
Quayle—2
Wallop—2

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

1—Official Business
2—Necessarily Absent
3—Illness
4—Other

SYMBOLS:

AY—Announced Yea
AN—Announced Nay
PY—Paired Yea
PN—Paired Nay

ANALYSIS OF ISSUE VOTED ON:

Party Cohesion

Democrats— 77%
Republicans— 76%

Measure of Party Support on Issue as Voted on

For (47)	*Against* (42)
Democrats— 9 or 19%	Democrats— 30 or 71%
Republicans— 38 or 81%	Republicans— 12 or 29%

Prepared and Compiled by Senate Democratic Policy Committee
Robert C. Byrd, Chairman

Opponents contended that the Hatfield amendment (Vote No. 119, 97th-2d), provides ample precedent for limiting production of weapons without the approval of the government where it is to be deployed. It makes little sense to produce the 155mm shell without consent from our European allies on deployment because the 155mm shell is intended to stop a large Soviet tank assault that would be massed in the narrow corridors of attack in Europe. The U.S. already has an eight inch shell and the Lance missile to serve this purpose, in spite of the fact that no NATO ally has accepted them. Recent reports indicate that nonnuclear high technology weapons may fill this role in the near future. It is clear, therefore, that the funds appropriated for the 155mm could be better used for production of conventional weapons which have been scaled back under this bill to meet the five percent growth allowed under the recently completed budget. In addition, this amendment would eliminate the language in the conference report on H.R. 3132 requiring that one shell be destroyed for each one produced.

SENATE VOTING RECORD

NO. 184

98th Congress
1st Session

July 13. 1983. 2:45 p.m.
Temp. Cong. Rec. p. S-9804

DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS

BILL NO.: S. 675 **AMENDMENT NO.:** 1468

TITLE: "Omnibus Defense Authorization Act, 1984."

SUBJECT: **Tower motion to table the Pryor, et al, amendment to prohibit the production of lethal binary chemical munitions (nerve gas) and related production, facilities, equipment, and precursor chemicals.** (See also Vote Nos. 118 and 119, 97th-2d.)

NOTE: Proponents of the amendment emphasized that money has already been appropriated for production facilities, but there is no reason to end our 14-year moratorium on building chemical weapons. The U.S. would be served better by resuming bilateral negotiations on chemical weapons, which the Administration has failed to pursue for two and a half years. The current 200,000 tons of U.S. chemical munitions provide adequate deterrence to Soviet attack and incentive for the Soviets to negotiate an arms control agreement. The Secretary of Defense has issued a report concluding that metal deterioration of the current inventory is not serious and that the military utility of both the 155 millimeter and 8-inch shells has not been seriously degraded. In order to enhance deterrence, the U.S. should establish a credible doctrine for retaliatory use of chemical weapons, which does not currently exist, and improve its ability to protect people from chemical weapons. These lethal weapons do not kill soldiers who possess the necessary protection, but a suffering civilian populace. Our NATO allies, in whose countries these weapons would most likely be used, refuse to accept deployment of new weapons, without which deterrence shall not be enhanced. The enormous cost of the chemical weapons program, which may range between $6 and $15 billion, would divert funds needlessly from other programs. In addition, one of the weapons in question, the "Big Eye" bomb, should be delayed because it has serious flaws and has undergone inadequate testing.

(OVER)

S. 675: Vote Nos. 181-195, 197-221, 244.

RESULT: **MOTION TO TABLE AGREED TO WITH VICE PRESIDENT VOTING YEA TO BREAK TIE**

ADMINISTRATION POSITION: YEA

YEAS (49)

Democrats (14 or 30%)

Bentsen
Bumpers
Dixon
Exon
Ford
Glenn
Heflin
Hollings
Jackson
Johnston
Long
Nunn
Stennis
Zorinsky

Republicans (35 or 67%)

Abdnor
Armstrong
Baker
Boschwitz
Cohen
D'Amato
Denton
Dole
Domenici
East
Garn
Hatch
Hawkins
Hecht
Helms
Humphrey
Jepsen
Kasten

Laxalt
Lugar
Mattingly
McClure
Nickles
Quayle
Rudman
Simpson
Stafford
Stevens
Symms
Thurmond
Tower
Trible
Wallop
Warner
Wilson

NAYS (49)

Democrats (32 or 70%)

Baucus
Biden
Bingaman
Boren
Bradley
Burdick
Byrd
Chiles
Cranston
DeConcini
Dodd
Eagleton
Hart
Huddleston
Inouye
Kennedy

Lautenberg
Leahy
Levin
Matsunaga
Melcher
Metzenbaum
Mitchell
Moynihan
Pell
Proxmire
Pryor
Randolph
Riegle
Sarbanes
Sasser
Tsongas

Republicans (17 or 33%)

Andrews
Chafee
Cochran
Danforth
Durenberger
Gorton
Grassley
Hatfield
Heinz
Kassebaum
Mathias
Packwood
Percy
Pressler
Roth
Specter
Weicker

NOT VOTING (2)

Democrats (0)

Republicans (2)

Goldwater—2
Murkowski—2AY

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

1—Official Business
2—Necessarily Absent
3—Illness
4—Other

SYMBOLS:

AY—Announced Yea
AN—Announced Nay
PY—Paired Yea
PN—Paired Nay

ANALYSIS OF ISSUE VOTED ON:

Party Cohesion

Democrats— 70%
Republicans— 67%

Measure of Party Support on Issue as Voted on

For (49)	*Against* (49)
Democrats— 14 or 29%	Democrats— 32 or 65%
Republicans— 35 or 71%	Republicans— 17 or 35%

Prepared and Compiled by Senate Democratic Policy Committee
Robert C. Byrd, Chairman

Opponents asserted that possession of retaliatory chemical ordinance during World War II deterred use of chemical warfare by our adversaries, not defensive measures. During the unilateral 14-year moratorium by the U.S., the Soviets have built a superior chemical warfare capability. Chemical warfare is an integral part of Soviet military doctrine and has been used by them or their surrogates in Southeast Asia and Afghanistan. The pending bill would provide the Soviets an incentive to negotiate by proscribing final assembly of the components of the 155mm binary artillery shell until 1985. Without acquisition of new chemical weapons, the Soviets would not be deterred from first-use of chemical warfare or have any incentive to negotiate an arms control agreement. The new weapons are needed because they are: (1) safer to store (even if hit by enemy attack) because the ingredients of the lethal agent are segregated until fired; (2) are armed with a nonpersistent agent necessary on the mobile modern battlefield; and (3) have a greater range than the current inventory. Furthermore, the aging shells now available, of which over one-half have undesirable persistent agents, will have deteriorated by 50 percent by 1990.

SENATE VOTING RECORD

NO. 186

98th Congress
1st Session

July 13, 1983, 6:14 p.m.
Temp. Cong. Rec. p. S-9825

DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS

BILL NO.: S. 675

AMENDMENT NO.: 1472

TITLE: "Omnibus Defense Authorization Act, 1984."

SUBJECT: **Tower motion to table the Mitchell, et al, amendment extending for two years the present prohibition against expansion of contracting out of firefighting and security functions at military installations.** (Subsequently, the Senate adopted the amendment by voice vote. See also Vote Nos. 95 and 96, 97th-2d.)

NOTE: Proponents of the amendment asserted that it was consistent with circular A-76, which encourages contracting-out of government functions, because it does not apply to "inherently governmental" functions such as security and safety of government property. The Senate adopted a similar amendment last year, which was modified in conference to provide a one-year moratorium. An extension would allow for completion and review of a report on the issue which is due on March 1, 1984. A memorandum by Air Force Vice Chief of Staff, Robert C. Mathis, states, "OMB uses contracting as a way to reduce civilian end strength without having to acknowledge the resultant degradation in defense capability." Contracting-out would restrict a commander's ability to meet his personal responsibility regarding safety and physical security of his command by removing the personnel performing these functions from his command. It could undermine base security because Defense employees, unlike their private counterparts, do not have the right to strike and must guarantee performance of their duties, notwithstanding any emergency. Contracting-out may not prove cost effective should reduced levels of security or inadequately trained firefighters cause losses to military property. It may jeopardize mutual support agreements on firefighting efforts between military bases and certain municipalities.

(OVER)

S. 675: Vote Nos. 181-195, 197-221, 244.

RESULT: MOTION TO TABLE DEFEATED

YEAS (44)

Democrats (4 or 9%)

Exon
Leahy
Proxmire
Zorinsky

Republicans (40 or 77%)

Abdnor
Andrews
Armstrong
Baker
Boschwitz
D'Amato
Danforth
Denton
Dole
Durenberger
East
Garn
Gorton
Grassley
Hatch
Hatfield
Hawkins
Hecht
Helms
Humphrey
Jepsen
Kassebaum
Kasten
Laxalt
Lugar
Mattingly
McClure
Nickles
Packwood
Pressler
Quayle
Rudman
Simpson
Stevens
Symms
Thurmond
Tower
Wallop
Warner
Wilson

NAYS (53)

Democrats (41 or 91%)

Baucus
Bentsen
Biden
Bingaman
Bradley
Bumpers
Burdick
Byrd
Chiles
Cranston
DeConcini
Dixon
Dodd
Eagleton
Ford
Glenn
Hart
Heflin
Hollings
Huddleston
Inouye
Jackson
Johnston
Kennedy
Lautenberg
Levin
Long
Matsunaga
Melcher
Metzenbaum
Mitchell
Moynihan
Nunn
Pell
Pryor
Randolph
Riegle
Sarbanes
Sasser
Stennis
Tsongas

Republicans (12 or 23%)

Chafee
Cochran
Cohen
Domenici
Heinz
Mathias
Percy
Roth
Specter
Stafford
Trible
Weicker

NOT VOTING (3)

Democrats (1)

Boren—2

Republicans (2)

Goldwater—2
Murkowski—2

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

1—Official Business
2—Necessarily Absent
3—Illness
4—Other

SYMBOLS:

AY—Announced Yea
AN—Announced Nay
PY—Paired Yea
PN—Paired Nay

ANALYSIS OF ISSUE VOTED ON:

Party Cohesion

Democrats— 91%
Republicans— 77%

Measure of Party Support on Issue as Voted on

For (44)
Democrats— 4 or 9%
Republicans— 40 or 91%

Against (53)
Democrats— 41 or 77%
Republicans— 12 or 23%

Prepared and Compiled by Senate Democratic Policy Committee
Robert C. Byrd, Chairman

Opponents of the amendment contended that Armed Services Committee hearings determined that the successful 40-year history of contracting-out for security and firefighting services has not undermined national security. This amendment is not consistent because it allows many important military installations to continue their current contracts, in spite of stated concerns about security. The moratorium has cost more than $50 million in FY 1983 at a time when Congress is trying to stretch defense dollars. The memorandum cited by proponents is not relevant because the problems it detailed have been reversed. Furthermore, the memorandum makes no pertinent reference to firefighting or security functions.

SENATE VOTING RECORD

NO. 187

98th Congress
1st Session

July 13, 1983, 8:54 p.m.
Temp. Cong. Rec. p. S-9852

DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS

BILL NO.: S. 675 — AMENDMENT NO.: 1473

TITLE: "Omnibus Defense Authorization Act, 1984."

SUBJECT: **Baker motion to table the Armstrong motion to waive the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to provide for the consideraton of the Armstrong, et al. amendment which reestablishes the GI Bill effective in FY 1987; provides a monthly basic educational assistance benefit of $300 to service members who complete 2 or more years of honorable service and a monthly benefit of $100 for Selected Reservists and National Guard members for each month of service; establishes a career members contributory educational program through which members with at least 10 years of honorable service may contribute from $25 to $100 a month (up to a maximum of $6,000) to a special education fund which would be matched 2 to 1 by DOD after a 24-month vesting period; and permits career service members to utilize their GI educational benefits without interrupting their military career.** (The amendment was subsequently ruled out of order, as being in violation of sections 303 and 311 of the Budget Act.)

NOTE: Proponents of the amendment asserted that it would reestablish the GI bill education benefit program in 1987 in anticipation of a coming recruitment crisis in our armed forces. The current incentive programs are not effective because they require large contributions by the participant. The recruitment problems experienced in the 1970's, which were the result of Congress' failure to maintain comparability with the private sector, have disappeared only temporarily with the recent pay raises and the highest unemployment since the Great Depression. Even as the economy recovers and job opportunities increase, the number of enlistment age youth is expected to decline by 15 percent or almost 1.3 million by 1987, a trend which is not expected to reverse for some time. The Army Research Institute has concluded that the Army could miss its recruiting total for male high school graduates by 34,000 by 1986, absent increases in military pay or education incentives. The amendment would

(OVER)

S. 675: Vote Nos. 181-195, 197-221, 244.

RESULT: MOTION TO TABLE AGREED TO

YEAS (52)

Democrats (14 or 30%)

Bentsen
Bingaman
Bumpers
Chiles
Eagleton
Exon
Johnston
Lautenberg
Long
Metzenbaum
Nunn
Proxmire
Stennis
Zorinsky

Republicans (38 or 73%)

Abdnor
Baker
Chafee
Cochran
Danforth
Denton
Domenici
Durenberger
East
Gorton
Grassley
Hatfield
Hecht
Heinz
Helms
Jepsen
Kassebaum
Laxalt
Lugar

Mathias
Mattingly
McClure
Nickles
Packwood
Percy
Quayle
Roth
Rudman
Simpson
Stafford
Stevens
Symms
Thurmond
Tower
Wallop
Warner
Weicker
Wilson

NAYS (46)

Democrats (32 or 70%)

Baucus
Biden
Boren
Bradley
Burdick
Byrd
Cranston
DeConcini
Dixon
Dodd
Ford
Glenn
Hart
Heflin
Hollings
Huddleston

Inouye
Jackson
Kennedy
Leahy
Levin
Matsunaga
Melcher
Mitchell
Moynihan
Pell
Pryor
Randolph
Riegle
Sarbanes
Sasser
Tsongas

Republicans (14 or 27%)

Andrews
Armstrong
Boschwitz
Cohen
D'Amato
Dole
Garn
Hatch
Hawkins
Humphrey
Kasten
Pressler
Specter
Trible

NOT VOTING (2)

Democrats (0)

Republicans (2)

Goldwater—2
Murkowski—2

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

1—Official Business
2—Necessarily Absent
3—Illness
4—Other

SYMBOLS:

AY—Announced Yea
AN—Announced Nay
PY—Paired Yea
PN—Paired Nay

ANALYSIS OF ISSUE VOTED ON:

Party Cohesion	**Measure of Party Support on Issue as Voted on**	
	For (52)	*Against* (46)
Democrats— 70%	Democrats— 14 or 27%	Democrats— 32 or 70%
Republicans— 73%	Republicans— 38 or 73%	Republicans— 14 or 30%

Prepared and Compiled by Senate Democratic Policy Committee
Robert C. Byrd, Chairman

attract highly capable recruits and encourage new recruits to complete their obligations. It would also improve retention of active personnel by inviting them to reenlist in order to qualify for GI benefits. Retention would be enhanced by allowing an individual to transfer benefits to a spouse or child. The benefits program, which would not take effect until 1987, would cost $7 million starting in 1989 and rise to a maximum of $486 million in 1993. This considerable cost, however, is but a small investment to ensure that capable soldiers man the weapons on which we have spent so much.

Opponents of the amendment contended that it was unnecessary when the armed forces have exceeded their recruitment standards and retention is high. Criticizing GI bill benefits as too broad and expensive, opponents favored focused incentives to meet the specific shortages in each field. The Defense Department, which opposes this amendment, currently has effective incentives available to encourage enlistment for the only branch in need, the Army's combat arms. Education benefits encourage soldiers to separate from the service in order to pursue an education and new career. Congress should not create another entitlement program without thorough consideration since such programs are the cause of the current fiscal crisis. Should an education benefits program prove needed, Congress can enact it in a timely fashion. The cost projections cited are understated, specifically, because they are not adjusted for inflation and, generally, because entitlement programs costs are impossible to anticipate. According to the CBO, this program could cost $1.4 billion by 1998.

SENATE VOTING RECORD

NO. 189

98th Congress

1st Session

July 14, 1983, 12:07 a.m.
Session of July 13, 1983
Temp. Cong. Rec. p. S-9874

DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS

BILL NO.: S. 675

TITLE: "Omnibus Defense Authorization Act, 1984."

SUBJECT: **Baker motion to table the Gorton motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Armed Services, with instructions to report back within two days of Senate session with a bill that complies with the figures in the conference report on the First Budget Resolution, without regard to $2.1 billion in assumed savings due to inflation set forth in a June 27 letter from the OMB to the Committee on Armed Services.**

NOTE: Proponents of the motion to recommit contended that the pending measure is based on questionable reductions in inflation assumptions that were altered late in the Committee's consideration of the bill and after the completion of the first budget resolution. The resultant $2.1 billion "savings" was used to fund multi-year procurement of the B-1B, a high Administration priority, and other programs. Such maneuvering is a product of the Administration's disdain for the budget spending targets. The revised figures by OMB are particularly suspect considering OMB Director Stockman's revelations in the William Greider article concerning manipulation of budget figures at the Administration's convenience. Moreover, Defense Secretary Weinberger has stated, "I do not worship with the faithful at the altar of the congressional budget process." Accepting these revised figures would make a mockery of the difficult budget compromise forged with the House to accept the Senate's higher five percent real growth in defense spending. History shows that Pentagon inflation projections are consistently low, including last year's which was almost a full two percentage points too low. Contentions that the CBO has certified the bill as under budget improperly interprets a CBO chart that merely reflects the OMB recent inflation adjustment. The CBO expects that the FY 1984 DOD programs would be underfunded and that any savings from adjustments in the inflation rate would eventually require a reduced number of weapons purchased, reprogramming and/or a supplemental appropriation.

(OVER)

S. 675: Vote Nos. 181-195, 197-221, 244.

RESULT: MOTION TO TABLE MOTION TO RECOMMIT AGREED TO

YEAS (53)

Democrats (13 or 30%)

Bingaman
Boren
Byrd
Dixon
Glenn
Heflin
Huddleston
Inouye
Jackson
Johnston
Nunn
Stennis
Zorinsky

Republicans (40 or 80%)

Abdnor
Andrews
Armstrong
Baker
Chafee
Cochran
Cohen
D'Amato
Denton
Dole
Domenici
East
Garn
Hatch
Hawkins
Hecht
Helms
Humphrey
Jepsen
Kassebaum
Kasten
Laxalt
Lugar
Mattingly
McClure
Nickles
Percy
Pressler
Quayle
Roth
Rudman
Simpson
Stevens
Symms
Thurmond
Tower
Trible
Wallop
Warner
Wilson

NAYS (41)

Democrats (31 or 70%)

Baucus
Bentsen
Biden
Bradley
Bumpers
Burdick
Chiles
Cranston
DeConcini
Dodd
Eagleton
Exon
Ford
Hart
Kennedy
Lautenberg
Leahy
Levin
Matsunaga
Melcher
Metzenbaum
Mitchell
Moynihan
Pell
Proxmire
Pryor
Randolph
Riegle
Sarbanes
Sasser
Tsongas

Republicans (10 or 20%)

Boschwitz
Danforth
Durenberger
Gorton
Grassley
Hatfield
Heinz
Mathias
Packwood
Specter

NOT VOTING (6)

Democrats (2)

Hollings—2
Long—2

Republicans (4)

Goldwater—2
Murkowski—2
Stafford—2
Weicker—2

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

1—Official Business
2—Necessarily Absent
3—Illness
4—Other

SYMBOLS:

AY—Announced Yea
AN—Announced Nay
PY—Paired Yea
PN—Paired Nay

ANALYSIS OF ISSUE VOTED ON:

Party Cohesion	**Measure of Party Support on Issue as Voted on**	
	For (53)	*Against* (41)
Democrats— 70%	Democrats— 13 or 25%	Democrats— 31 or 76%
Republicans— 80%	Republicans— 40 or 75%	Republicans— 10 or 24%

Prepared and Compiled by Senate Democratic Policy Committee
Robert C. Byrd, Chairman

Opponents of the motion to recommit contended that the bill is $1.1 billion below the budget ceiling in obligational authority. The growth in Defense spending-allowed under this bill is actually only 4.6 percent, well within the budget targets. The Committee delayed its consideration in order to accommodate the lengthy proceedings on the budget and comply with the budget targets that were ultimately set. The reduced inflation adjustments are not a last minute contrivance. Rather, the savings were proposed as early as May 5 in Committee, but could not be validated by OMB until late in the Committee's consideration of the bill. Even if the inflation savings are discounted, the bill would only be $400 million above the non-binding budget targets.

SENATE VOTING RECORD

NO. 190

98th Congress
1st Session

July 14, 1983, 1:31 p.m.
Temp. Cong. Rec. p. S-9946

DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS

BILL NO.: S. 675 **AMENDMENT NO.:** 1477

TITLE: "Omnibus Defense Authorization Act, 1984."

SUBJECT: **Tower motion to table the Nunn-Hatch-Johnston, et al, amendment shifting $888 million from multiyear procurement of the B-1 bomber to finance conventional force modernization programs.** (See also Vote Nos. 131 and 190, 98th-1st, and Nos. 448 and 450, 97th-1st.)

NOTE: Proponents of the amendment asserted that the B-1B fails to meet the statutory definition of stability of design with a fixed and determined cost which is required for multiyear procurement. First, the B-1B requires redesigning of at least 20 percent of the airframe, 30 percent of the offensive radar, and 40 percent of the defensive avionics. Second, the Air Force Cost Analysis Improvement Group estimated the B-1's true cost would be $4 billion higher than the official estimate while the GAO claims the overrun will be as much as $20 billion. The production schedule proposed under MYP funding is unrealistic. The schedule calls for production of 1 B-1B in 1982, 7 in 1983, 10 in 1984, 34 in 1985, 48 in 1986, and none in 1987. It is unlikely, however, that Congress would be able so precipitously to halt production of a weapons program that will employ over 50,000 workers. Instead, Congress would bow to the considerable constituency supporting the program and continue production well beyond 1986. In this manner, the B-1 could delay the Stealth program, which is the only bomber that everyone is confident could penetrate Soviet defenses in the 1990's. The amendment would provide a more realistic bomber production schedule of 1, 7, 10, 31, 36, and 15, respectively for FY 1982-87. It would, therefore, allow a smoother transition from the B-1 to eventual production of the Stealth bomber. Accepting the Air Force's cost estimates, a rescheduling of production would add $1.5 billion in cost to the B-1B program

(OVER)

S. 675: Vote Nos. 181-195, 197-221, 244.

RESULT: MOTION TO TABLE AGREED TO

YEAS (56)

Democrats (10 or 23%)

Bentsen
Boren
DeConcini
Dixon
Exon
Glenn
Metzenbaum
Randolph
Sasser
Zorinsky

Republicans (46 or 87%)

Abdnor
Andrews
Armstrong
Baker
Boschwitz
Cochran
Cohen
D'Amato
Denton
Dole
Domenici
Durenberger
East
Garn
Gorton
Hawkins
Hecht
Heinz
Helms
Humphrey
Jepsen
Kassebaum
Kasten
Laxalt
Lugar
Mattingly
McClure
Murkowski
Nickles
Packwood
Percy
Quayle
Roth
Rudman
Simpson
Specter
Stafford
Stevens
Symms
Thurmond
Tower
Trible
Wallop
Warner
Weicker
Wilson

NAYS (41)

Democrats (34 or 77%)

Baucus
Biden
Bingaman
Bradley
Bumpers
Burdick
Byrd
Chiles
Dodd
Eagleton
Ford
Hart
Heflin
Huddleston
Inouye
Jackson
Johnston
Kennedy
Lautenberg
Leahy
Levin
Long
Matsunaga
Melcher
Mitchell
Moynihan
Nunn
Pell
Proxmire
Pryor
Riegle
Sarbanes
Stennis
Tsongas

Republicans (7 or 13%)

Chafee
Danforth
Grassley
Hatch
Hatfield
Mathias
Pressler

NOT VOTING (3)

Democrats (2)

Cranston—2
Hollings—2

Republicans (1)

Goldwater—2

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

1—Official Business
2—Necessarily Absent
3—Illness
4—Other

SYMBOLS:

AY—Announced Yea
AN—Announced Nay
PY—Paired Yea
PN—Paired Nay

ANALYSIS OF ISSUE VOTED ON:

Party Cohesion	Measure of Party Support on Issue as Voted on	
	For (56)	*Against* (41)
Democrats— 77%	Democrats— 10 or 18%	Democrats— 34 or 83%
Republicans— 87%	Republicans— 46 or 82%	Republicans— 7 or 17%

Prepared and Compiled by Senate Democratic Policy Committee
Robert C. Byrd, Chairman

for a total program cost of $22 billion. The Air Force cost estimates, however, are based on illusory economies that are unlikely to be achieved. In contrast, this amendment would realize a net $1 billion in savings in the overall defense budget by correcting serious underfunding of important conventional weapons, including 3 F-15 fighters, 120 M-1 tanks, 16 AAH-64 helicopters, and 238 Patriot air defense missiles and funds for a fleet oiler and an amphibious assault ship.

Opponents of the amendment asserted that MYP is an essential component of the President's certification of the B-1B cost at $20.5 billion, which was made at the behest of Congress. Any action that adversely affects the current B-1B program will add to its cost and delay its full operation capability. As a result of certification and the personal commitment of the President and the Defense Secretary, the B-1B program is ahead of schedule and below cost. The design changes required for the B-52 are less significant than the modifications of the G and H models of the B-52, the bombers now in service. The high cost estimates cited by proponents are two years old and assume expensive modifications that were never part of the program. The B-1B would fill the gap between the coming obsolescence of the B-52 and the full operating capability of the Stealth bomber. Should production of the B-1B be cancelled and the Stealth technology fail to develop on schedule, the U.S. could be left with a 40-year-old B-52 as the only manned bomber for the 1990's. The B-1B has a small radar cross section, penetration speed at low altitudes, and maneuverability to cope with modern air defenses. It will be able to penetrate Soviet air defenses which are likely to be disrupted by our IBM forces in the event of a nuclear exchange. The B-1B, however, can be justifed solely as a conventional weapons bomber. It can fly faster, farther without refueling, and carry more ordinance than the B-52. The B-1B would allow the U.S. to project power to distant areas without straining our already over-worked air tankers and without reliance on foreign bases.

SENATE VOTING RECORD

NO. 194

98th Congress
1st Session

July 14, 1983, 8:20 p.m.
Temp. Cong. Rec. p. S-9995

DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS

BILL NO.: S. 675 **AMENDMENT NO.:** 1488

TITLE: "Omnibus Defense Authorization Act, 1984."

SUBJECT: **Tower motion to table the Levin, et al, amendment restoring $582 million in outlays and $2.7 billion in budget authority for readiness and for conventional weapons capabilities that were in the original budget submission, including hospital repairs, combat feedings, clothing and medical material, aircraft spares, a fleet oiler vessel, airlift replenishment spares, aircraft modifications, ground support equipment, a mine counter measure ship, Navy flying hours, depot maintenance, Army maintenance support, Harpoon and Phoenix missiles, and mobility equipment for the Rapid Deployment Force.**

NOTE: Proponents of the amendment stated that it would restore Armed Services Committee cuts in 47 combat readiness areas which are critically important but often neglected. Procurement of strategic nuclear systems is being pursued at the expense of the more basic and necessary conventional forces and military readiness programs. General Bernard Rogers, NATO Supreme Commander in Europe, has warned, "We have mortgaged our defense to the nuclear response." If attacked conventionally under current conditions, he added, the U.S. would have to launch a nuclear attack fairly quickly because our conventional combat forces could not be sustained. Readiness and personnel requirements are continually being underfunded in order to afford unnecessary nuclear systems such as the MX, a dangerous, destabilizing weapon which is set to receive twice the amount of budget authority and triple the amount of outlays provided for in this amendment. If either the B-1 Bomber or the MX programs were deleted from the defense budget, proponents pointed out, there would be more than enough funding for these vital restorations. Opponents argued that funding for combat readiness has increased

(OVER)

S. 675: Vote Nos. 181-195, 197-221, 244.

RESULT: **MOTION TO TABLE AGREED TO**

YEAS (60)

Democrats (10 or 23%)

Bentsen
Burdick
Dixon
Heflin
Jackson
Long
Melcher
Proxmire
Stennis
Zorinsky

Republicans (50 or 100%)

Abdnor
Andrews
Armstrong
Baker
Boschwitz
Chafee
Cochran
Cohen
D'Amato
Danforth
Denton
Dole
Domenici
Durenberger
East
Garn
Gorton
Grassley
Hatch
Hatfield
Hawkins
Hecht
Heinz
Helms
Humphrey
Jepsen
Kassebaum
Kasten
Laxalt
Lugar
Mathias
Mattingly
McClure
Murkowski
Nickles
Packwood
Pressler
Quayle
Roth
Rudman
Simpson
Specter
Stafford
Stevens
Symms
Thurmond
Tower
Trible
Warner
Wilson

NAYS (34)

Democrats (34 or 77%)

Baucus
Biden
Bingaman
Boren
Bradley
Bumpers
Byrd
Chiles
DeConcini
Dodd
Eagleton
Exon
Ford
Glenn
Hart
Huddleston
Inouye
Johnston
Kennedy
Lautenberg
Leahy
Levin
Matsunaga
Metzenbaum
Mitchell
Moynihan
Nunn
Pell
Pryor
Randolph
Riegle
Sarbanes
Sasser
Tsongas

Republicans (0 or 0%)

NOT VOTING (6)

Democrats (2)

Cranston—2
Hollings—2

Republicans (4)

Goldwater—2
Percy—2
Wallop—2
Weicker—2

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

1—Official Business
2—Necessarily Absent
3—Illness
4—Other

SYMBOLS:

AY—Announced Yea
AN—Announced Nay
PY—Paired Yea
PN—Paired Nay

ANALYSIS OF ISSUE VOTED ON:

Party Cohesion	**Measure of Party Support on Issue as Voted on** *For* (60)	*Against* (34)
Democrats— 77%	Democrats— 10 or 17%	Democrats— 34 or 100%
Republicans— 100%	Republicans— 50 or 83%	Republicans— 0 or 0%

Prepared and Compiled by Senate Democratic Policy Committee
Robert C. Byrd, Chairman

significantly in recent years and that the current bill contains adequate funding in this area, but recent increases have not been sufficient to permit the Committee's drastic spending cuts. In the past four years, procurement accounts have grown more than 88 percent and R&D spending has almost doubled, while O&M experienced only a 20 percent real growth rate. Some readiness and sustainability items are obtained with procurement monies, they admitted, but funding for these account components declined by 18 percent in FY 1983 while funding for nuclear weapons procurement continued to soar. The Administration's 5-year defense plan for FY 1983-87 continues this imbalanced spending scale with O&M funding falling another 25 percent and procurement climbing by 58 percent. Congress must face the need to reduce spending, they agreed, but long-term modernization requirements must be balanced with near-term readiness and sustainability needs, and the funding of potentially disastrous procurement programs such as the MX must cease.

Opponents of the amendment stated that the United States' strategic nuclear capability is a major deterrent to the Soviet Union or any potential attacker and the importance of these forces should not be underestimated given the enormous conventional capability of the USSR. Strategic expenditures amount to only 14 to 15 percent of the defense budget which is a very small amount considering their importance in preventing nuclear war. The military items covered by this amendment are also vitally necessary, they agreed, but budgetary constrictions, not overfunding of strategic systems, are responsible for the funding cuts. The amendment is a "budget buster" which contains no offset for its $2.7 billion budget increase and would push the budget approximately $1.9 billion over ceiling estimates. If the authorization process is to have any credibility or the Armed Services Committee is to maintain its influence on national security policy, this amendment must be defeated.

SENATE VOTING RECORD

NO. 208

98th Congress
1st Session

July 18, 1983, 5:49 p.m.
Temp. Cong. Rec. p. S-10273

DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS

BILL NO.: S. 675 **AMENDMENT NO.:** 1520

TITLE: "Omnibus Defense Authorization Act, 1984."

SUBJECT: **Tower motion to table the Stafford, et al, amendment extending by two years, from May 4, 1984, to May 4, 1986, the effective date for transferring the administration of the Department of Defense dependent school system (DODDS) to the Department of Education, as required by P.L. 96-88, the Department of Education Organization Act.** (See Vote No. 209.)

NOTE: Proponents of the amendment contended that the overseas school system, the equivalent of the eleventh largest U.S. school district, should be administered by an education agency. Department of Education administration would afford students access to the best educational resources and ease the transition of students who alternate between overseas and U.S. schools. A 1981 Department of Education report to Congress detailed a number of serious program and management deficiencies of the current system and offered recommendations for remedial actions. Transfer to the new department would provide an opportunity to implement those solutions. Committee action prohibiting the transfer would reverse repeated Congressional decisions, proponents noted, and bypass consideration by the Governmental Affairs Committee. This amendment would permit continued authority for the transfer while allowing additional time for necessary preparations.

Opponents of the amendment claimed the transfer would adversely affect the quality of life of armed forces personnel and of DODDS teachers, and disrupt the education of students in the system. Overseas students have a higher SAT score average than the national average—clear evidence that they already receive a quality education. The current arrangement provides educational stability to a highly transient military population and offers close coordination with the military with respect to restationing logistics. In contrast, the transfer would create an administrative morass that would interfere with the success of the volunteer military. In addition, the benefits guaranteed in the NATO Status of Forces Agreement probably would have to be provided by another entity, at considerable cost, if DODDS teachers were no longer employed by DOD. Opponents claimed that NEA and Overseas Education Association leadership support for the transfer was politically motivated and lacking the widespread support of their constituents.

See also Vote No. 422 (95th-2d), No. 63 (96th-1st), and No. 94 (97th-2d).

S. 675: Vote Nos. 181-195, 197-221, 244.

RESULT: **MOTION TO TABLE DEFEATED**

YEAS (42)

Democrats (6 or 14%)

Exon
Kennedy
Levin
Long
Moynihan
Stennis

Republicans (36 or 72%)

Abdnor
Baker
Cochran
Cohen
D'Amato
Danforth
Denton
Dole
Durenberger
East
Garn
Gorton
Grassley
Hatch
Hawkins
Hecht
Helms
Humphrey
Jepsen
Kassebaum
Kasten
Laxalt
Lugar
Mattingly
McClure
Murkowski
Nickles
Pressler
Quayle
Rudman
Simpson
Symms
Thurmond
Tower
Wallop
Wilson

NAYS (50)

Democrats (36 or 86%)

Baucus
Bentsen
Biden
Bingaman
Boren
Bradley
Burdick
Byrd
Chiles
DeConcini
Dixon
Dodd
Eagleton
Ford
Hart
Heflin
Hollings
Huddleston
Inouye
Jackson
Johnston
Leahy
Matsunaga
Melcher
Metzenbaum
Mitchell
Nunn
Pell
Proxmire
Pryor
Randolph
Riegle
Sarbanes
Sasser
Tsongas
Zorinsky

Republicans (14 or 28%)

Andrews
Armstrong
Boschwitz
Chafee
Hatfield
Heinz
Mathias
Percy
Roth
Specter
Stafford
Trible
Warner
Weicker

NOT VOTING (8)

Democrats (4)

Bumpers—2
Cranston—2
Glenn—2
Lautenberg—2

Republicans (4)

Domenici—2
Goldwater—2
Packwood—2
Stevens—2

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

1—Official Business
2—Necessarily Absent
3—Illness
4—Other

SYMBOLS:

AY—Announced Yea
AN—Announced Nay
PY—Paired Yea
PN—Paired Nay

ANALYSIS OF ISSUE VOTED ON:

Party Cohesion	**Measure of Party Support on Issue as Voted on**	
	For (42)	*Against* (50)
Democrats— 86%	Democrats— 6 or 14%	Democrats— 36 or 72%
Republicans— 72%	Republicans— 36 or 86%	Republicans— 14 or 28%

Prepared and Compiled by Senate Democratic Policy Committee
Robert C. Byrd. Chairman

SENATE VOTING RECORD

NO. 209

98th Congress
1st Session

July 19, 1983, 2:21 p.m.
Temp. Cong. Rec. p. S-10332

DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS

BILL NO.: S. 675 AMENDMENT NO.: 1523

TITLE: "Omnibus Defense Authorization Act, 1984."

SUBJECT: **Quayle amendment (as a substitute for the Stafford, et al, amendment—Vote No. 208) prohibiting the transfer of the administration of the Department of Defense dependent school system (DODDS) to the Department of Education before May 4, 1986 (rather than no later than May 4, 1986) and stating that the transfer will occur only if the President or Congress determines that it will not be detrimental to the education of the dependent children, the welfare of the teachers, or the morale of military personnel abroad.**

NOTE: Proponents argued that this amendment was a genuine compromise, leaving transfer authority intact but giving the President and Congress additional time to focus primarily on the quality of eduation DODDS provides. The amendment puts the burden of proving that the transfer would enhance overseas students' education upon those who favor it. The overseas schools have been under the jurisdiction of DOD since the 1800's; there is no reason to transfer them. In the last decade, students in overseas schools have achieved higher SAT scores than the stateside average—clear evidence that they already receive a quality education. Proponents asserted that there is overwhelming opposition to the transfer from students, parents, the Departments of Education and Defense, and from many DODDS teachers even though their union leadership supports the transfer.

Opponents noted that Congress voted by very large majorities to transfer DODDS to the Department of Education at the time the Department was created. To allow a reasonable time for preparations, the transfer was scheduled to take place by May 4, 1983. Last year, the deadline was extended one year. The principle of another extension was accepted by the previous vote, but this amendment goes beyond an extension by providing the President veto power to halt the transfer, even though Congress approved it. Opponents pointed out that the Overseas Education Association, which represents 80 percent of the teachers in DOD, the National Schoolboards Association, the American Association of School Administrators, and the National PTA support the underlying amendment.

See also Vote No. 422 (95th-2d), No. 63 (96th-1st), and No. 94 (97th-2d).

S. 675: Vote Nos. 181-195, 197-221, 244.

RESULT: AMENDMENT AGREED TO

YEAS (47)

Democrats (8 or 19%)

Bumpers
Exon
Huddleston
Johnston
Kennedy
Levin
Moynihan
Stennis

Republicans (39 or 78%)

Abdnor
Armstrong
Baker
Cochran
Cohen
D'Amato
Danforth
Denton
Dole
Durenberger
East
Garn
Gorton
Grassley
Hatch
Hawkins
Hecht
Helms
Humphrey
Jepsen
Kassebaum
Kasten
Laxalt
Lugar
Mattingly
McClure
Murkowski
Nickles
Pressler
Quayle
Rudman
Simpson
Stevens
Symms
Thurmond
Tower
Trible
Wallop
Wilson

NAYS (46)

Democrats (35 or 81%)

Baucus
Bentsen
Biden
Bingaman
Boren
Bradley
Burdick
Byrd
Chiles
DeConcini
Dixon
Dodd
Eagleton
Ford
Hart
Heflin
Hollings
Inouye
Jackson
Lautenberg
Leahy
Long
Matsunaga
Metzenbaum
Mitchell
Nunn
Pell
Proxmire
Pryor
Randolph
Riegle
Sarbanes
Sasser
Tsongas
Zorinsky

Republicans (11 or 22%)

Andrews
Boschwitz
Chafee
Hatfield
Heinz
Mathias
Percy
Roth
Specter
Stafford
Weicker

NOT VOTING (7)

Democrats (3)

Cranston—2
Glenn—2
Melcher—2AN

Republicans (4)

Domenici—3
Goldwater—2
Packwood—2
Warner—2

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

1—Official Business
2—Necessarily Absent
3—Illness
4—Other

SYMBOLS:

AY—Announced Yea
AN—Announced Nay
PY—Paired Yea
PN—Paired Nay

ANALYSIS OF ISSUE VOTED ON:

Party Cohesion

Democrats— 81%
Republicans— 78%

Measure of Party Support on Issue as Voted on

For (47)	*Against* (46)
Democrats— 8 or 17%	Democrats— 35 or 76%
Republicans— 39 or 83%	Republicans— 11 or 24%

Prepared and Compiled by Senate Democratic Policy Committee
Robert C. Byrd, Chairman

SENATE VOTING RECORD

NO. 214

98th Congress
1st Session

July 21, 1983, 11:35 a.m.
Temp. Cong. Rec. p. S-10538

DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS
(CLOTURE)

BILL NO.: S. 675

TITLE: "Omnibus Defense Authorization Act, 1984."

SUBJECT: **Baker, et al, motion to close further debate on the Committee substitute for the bill.**

The cloture petition, presented on July 19, 1983, was signed by Senators Baker, Tower, Quayle, Warner, Jepsen, Rudman, East, Garn, Stafford, Trible, Armstrong, Durenberger, Wallop, Hecht, Hawkins, Kasten, and Cohen.

S. 675: Vote Nos. 181-195, 197-221, 244.

RESULT: CLOTURE MOTION REJECTED, 3/5THS NOT HAVING VOTED IN THE AFFIRMATIVE

ADMINISTRATION POSITION: YEA

YEAS (55)

Democrats (6 or 13%)

DeConcini
Exon
Heflin
Jackson
Johnston
Zorinsky

Republicans (49 or 96%)

Abdnor
Andrews
Armstrong
Baker
Boschwitz
Chafee
Cochran
Cohen
D'Amato
Danforth
Denton
Dole
Durenberger
East
Garn
Gorton
Grassley
Hatch
Hawkins
Hecht
Heinz
Helms
Humphrey
Jepsen
Kassebaum
Kasten
Laxalt
Lugar
Mathias
Mattingly
McClure
Murkowski
Nickles
Percy
Pressler
Quayle
Roth
Rudman
Simpson
Stafford
Stevens
Symms
Thurmond
Tower
Trible
Wallop
Warner
Weicker
Wilson

NAYS (41)

Democrats (39 or 87%)

Baucus
Bentsen
Biden
Bingaman
Boren
Bradley
Bumpers
Burdick
Byrd
Chiles
Cranston
Dixon
Dodd
Eagleton
Ford
Glenn
Hart
Hollings
Huddleston
Inouye
Kennedy
Lautenberg
Leahy
Levin
Long
Matsunaga
Melcher
Metzenbaum
Mitchell
Moynihan
Nunn
Proxmire
Pryor
Randolph
Riegle
Sarbanes
Sasser
Stennis
Tsongas

Republicans (2 or 4%)

Packwood
Specter

NOT VOTING (4)

Democrats (1)

Pell—[2]

Republicans (3)

Domenici—[3]
Goldwater—[2]
Hatfield—[2]

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

1—Official Business
2—Necessarily Absent
3—Illness
4—Other

SYMBOLS:

AY—Announced Yea
AN—Announced Nay
PY—Paired Yea
PN—Paired Nay

ANALYSIS OF ISSUE VOTED ON:

Party Cohesion	**Measure of Party Support on Issue as Voted on**	
	For (55)	*Against* (41)
Democrats— 87%	Democrats— 6 or 11%	Democrats— 39 or 95%
Republicans— 96%	Republicans— 49 or 89%	Republicans— 2 or 5%

Prepared and Compiled by Senate Democratic Policy Committee
Robert C. Byrd, Chairman

SENATE VOTING RECORD

NO. 215

98th Congress
1st Session

July 21, 1983, 1:20 p.m.
Temp. Cong. Rec. p. S-10547

DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS

BILL NO.: S. 675

AMENDMENT NO.: 2061

TITLE: "Omnibus Defense Authorization Act, 1984."

SUBJECT: **Mattingly motion to table the Moynihan-Jackson, et al, amendment extending, from July 31, 1983, to September 30, 1983, the grace period for the implementation of the regulations denying Federal educational assistance to students who have failed to file a statement of draft registration compliance.** (See also Vote Nos. 192, 193, and 216.)

NOTE: Proponents of the amendment contended that a further delay was justified due to the confusion stemming from a March 7 district court injunction against enforcement of the law, which requires verification of a student's draft registration in order to qualify for student aid. The Supreme Court stayed the injunction on June 29, clearing the way for enforcement of the regulation. Many students, who would be difficult to contact prior to their return to school, left campus last spring with the understanding that no certification would be required. For that reason, it would be prudent to honor the request of every major college association to allow colleges to inform students of their responsibility and collect the certification forms during registration on campus this fall. Lenders have already processed many loan applications, which schools had certified prior to the Supreme Court's stay. Without an extension, lenders might stop processing applications and checks until the situation is resolved. A 30-day grace period would not undermine registration because compliance among the potential draft-eligible men is 98.5 percent. This delay in no way minimizes the responsibility of students to register and for universities to enforce this requirement.

(OVER)

S. 675: Vote Nos. 181-195, 197-221, 244.

RESULT: MOTION TO TABLE DEFEATED

YEAS (46)

Democrats (7 or 15%)

DeConcini
Dixon
Exon
Johnston
Nunn
Proxmire
Zorinsky

Republicans (39 or 81%)

Abdnor
Armstrong
Boschwitz
Cochran
Cohen
D'Amato
Denton
Dole
East
Garn
Gorton
Grassley
Hatch
Hawkins
Hecht
Helms
Humphrey
Jepsen
Kassebaum
Kasten
Laxalt
Lugar
Mattingly
McClure
Murkowski
Nickles
Packwood
Percy
Quayle
Roth
Rudman
Simpson
Stevens
Symms
Thurmond
Tower
Trible
Wallop
Wilson

NAYS (48)

Democrats (39 or 85%)

Baucus
Bentsen
Biden
Bingaman
Boren
Bradley
Bumpers
Burdick
Byrd
Chiles
Cranston
Dodd
Eagleton
Ford
Glenn
Hart
Heflin
Hollings
Huddleston
Inouye
Jackson
Kennedy
Lautenberg
Leahy
Levin
Long
Matsunaga
Melcher
Metzenbaum
Mitchell
Moynihan
Pell
Pryor
Randolph
Riegle
Sarbanes
Sasser
Stennis
Tsongas

Republicans (9 or 19%)

Andrews
Chafee
Danforth
Durenberger
Heinz
Mathias
Specter
Stafford
Weicker

NOT VOTING (6)

Democrats (0)

Republicans (6)

Baker—^{2}
Domenici—^{3}
Goldwater—^{2}
Hatfield—^{2}
Pressler—^{2}
Warner—^{2}

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

1—Official Business
2—Necessarily Absent
3—Illness
4—Other

SYMBOLS:

AY—Announced Yea
AN—Announced Nay
PY—Paired Yea
PN—Paired Nay

ANALYSIS OF ISSUE VOTED ON:

Party Cohesion	**Measure of Party Support on Issue as Voted on**	
	For (46)	*Against* (48)
Democrats— 85%	Democrats— 7 or 15%	Democrats— 39 or 81%
Republicans— 81%	Republicans— 39 or 85%	Republicans— 9 or 19%

Prepared and Compiled by Senate Democratic Policy Committee
Robert C. Byrd, Chairman

Opponents of the amendment asserted that this delay would trivialize the efforts of 98 percent of the draft-eligible men who have registered by providing a further delay for the convenience of an irresponsible few. A delay is unnecessary because the Department of Education has already extended the compliance period on two separate occasions for a total of 60 days. The regulation's minimal requirement can be met without disruption because the Education Department only requires a statement by students that they have registered. Compared with the work required to establish a student's eligibility for aid, this regulation makes minimal demands. A further extension would be costly because the Department must publish a new notice in the Federal Register and mail a note to every financial aid officer in the U.S. The Department of Education has already addressed the concern of opponents by providing a 60-day grace period to fill out a simple form. The Senate has already fulfilled its role by establishing registration for the draft as a requirement for receiving student aid. The Senate should have no further role in fine tuning the administrative decisions of the Department of Education.

SENATE VOTING RECORD

NO. 216

98th Congress
1st Session

July 21, 1983, 3:00 p.m.
Temp. Cong. Rec. p. S-10552

DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS

BILL NO.: S. 675

AMENDMENT NO.: 2061

TITLE: "Omnibus Defense Authorization Act, 1984."

SUBJECT: **Moynihan-Jackson, et al, amendment extending, from July 31, 1983, to September 30, 1983, the grace period for the implementation of the regulation denying Federal educational assistance to students who have failed to file a statement of draft registration compliance.** (See also Vote Nos. 192, 193, and 215.)

NOTE: Proponents contended that a further delay was justified due to the confusion stemming from a March 7 district court injunction against enforcement of the law, which requires verification of a student's draft registration in order to qualify for student aid. The Supreme Court stayed the injunction on June 29, clearing the way for enforcement of the regulation. Many students, who would be difficult to contact prior to their return to school, left campus last spring with the understanding that no certification would be required. For this reason, it would be prudent to honor the request of every major college association to allow colleges to inform students of their responsibility and collect the certification forms during registration on campus this fall. Lenders have already processed many loan applications, which schools had certified prior to the Supreme Court's stay. Without an extension, lenders might stop processing applications and checks until the situation is resolved. A 30-day grace period would not undermine registration because compliance among the potential draft-eligible men is 98.5 percent. This delay in no way minimizes the responsibility of students to register and for universities to enforce this requirement.

(OVER)

S. 675: Vote Nos. 181-195, 197-221, 244.

RESULT: AMENDMENT AGREED TO

YEAS (56)

Democrats (40 or 89%)

Baucus
Bentsen
Biden
Bingaman
Boren
Bradley
Bumpers
Burdick
Byrd
Chiles
Cranston
DeConcini
Dodd
Eagleton
Ford
Glenn
Hart
Heflin
Hollings
Huddleston
Inouye
Jackson
Kennedy
Lautenberg
Leahy
Levin
Long
Matsunaga
Melcher
Metzenbaum
Mitchell
Moynihan
Pell
Pryor
Randolph
Riegle
Sarbanes
Sasser
Stennis
Tsongas

Republicans (16 or 31%)

Andrews
Chafee
Cohen
D'Amato
Danforth
Dole
Durenberger
Heinz
Mathias
Packwood
Percy
Simpson
Specter
Stafford
Warner
Weicker

NAYS (40)

Democrats (5 or 11%)

Dixon
Johnston
Nunn
Proxmire
Zorinsky

Republicans (35 or 69%)

Abdnor
Armstrong
Baker
Boschwitz
Cochran
Denton
East
Garn
Gorton
Grassley
Hatch
Hawkins
Hecht
Helms
Humphrey
Jepsen
Kassebaum
Kasten
Laxalt
Lugar
Mattingly
McClure
Murkowski
Nickles
Pressler
Quayle
Roth
Rudman
Stevens
Symms
Thurmond
Tower
Trible
Wallop
Wilson

NOT VOTING (4)

Democrats (1)

Exon—2

Republicans (3)

Domenici—3
Goldwater—2
Hatfield—2

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

1—Official Business
2—Necessarily Absent
3—Illness
4—Other

SYMBOLS:

AY—Announced Yea
AN—Announced Nay
PY—Paired Yea
PN—Paired Nay

ANALYSIS OF ISSUE VOTED ON:

Party Cohesion	**Measure of Party Support on Issue as Voted on**	
	For (56)	*Against* (40)
Democrats— 89%	Democrats— 40 or 71%	Democrats— 5 or 13%
Republicans— 69%	Republicans— 16 or 29%	Republicans— 35 or 87%

Prepared and Compiled by Senate Democratic Policy Committee
Robert C. Byrd, Chairman

.Opponents asserted that this delay would trivialize the efforts of 98 percent of the draft-eligible males who have registered by providing a further delay for the convenience of an irresponsible few. A delay is unnecessary because the Education Department has already extended the compliance period on two separate occasions for a total of 60 days. The regulation's minimal requirement can be met without disruption because the Education Department only requires a statement by students that they have registered. Compared with the work required to establish a student's eligibility for aid, this regulation makes minimal demands. A further extension would be costly because the Department must publish a new notice in the Federal Register and mail a note to every financial aid officer in the U.S. The Department of Education has already addressed the concern of opponents by providing a 60-day grace period to fill out a simple form. The Senate has already fulfilled its role by establishing registration for the draft as a requirement for receiving student aid. The Senate should have no further role in fine tuning the administrative decisions of the Department of Education.

SENATE VOTING RECORD

NO. 217

98th Congress
1st Session

July 25, 1983, 5:30 p.m.
Temp. Cong. Rec. p. S-10748

DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS

BILL NO.: S. 675 **AMENDMENT NO.:** 2086

TITLE: "Omnibus Defense Authorization Act, 1984."

SUBJECT: **Tower motion to table the Melcher amendment permitting the transfer of funds to recruiting activities (from media and advertising) in order to provide military personnel of Grade E-1 with less than four months service with the four percent COLA provided for all other military personnel under the bill.** (See also Vote No. 206.)

NOTE: Proponents of the amendment argued that the goals for both enlisted and officer recruits have been met, but the quality and caliber of the recruits must be upgraded. It is entirely appropriate to subtract from the Pentagon's $130 million media advertising budget the funds necessary to pay all E-1's the same cost-of-living adjustment as the other grades. E-1's and E-2's are typically on duty up to 60 hours a week and are in for a 3-year hitch. Penalizing new entrants is not the way to attract the kind of people the volunteer military needs. Although the estimated cost of $14 million dollars is modest, this debate is necessary to protect those at the bottom from becoming the scapegoats of efforts to hold down military costs. Denying E-1's the four percent COLA will recreate pay compression problems. While the President, they noted, did not include military COLA's in his budget, and the House recommended that neither E-1 nor E-2 grades receive a raise, the Senate should support these members of the military.

Opponents contended that this is the same amendment that was soundly defeated nine days earlier except that it provides financing for the E-1 COLA. The change does not justify adoption, however. The decision to delay the E-1 COLA was reached after extensive hearings and study of the compensation system including all the mistakes of the recent past. It was concluded that once recruits have completed

(OVER)

S. 675: Vote Nos. 181-195, 197-221, 244.

RESULT: **MOTION TO TABLE AGREED TO**

YEAS (56)			NAYS (26)		NOT VOTING (18)	
Democrats (10 or 28%)	**Republicans (46 or 100%)**		**Democrats (26 or 72%)**	**Republicans (0 or 0%)**	**Democrats (10)**	**Republicans (8)**
Bentsen	Abdnor	Kasten	Baucus		Biden—2	Domenici—3
Bradley	Andrews	Laxalt	Bingaman		Boren—2	Garn—2
Dixon	Armstrong	Lugar	Bumpers		Chiles—2	Gorton—2
Exon	Baker	Mathias	Burdick		Cranston—2	Hatch—2
Jackson	Boschwitz	Mattingly	Byrd		Ford—2	Kassebaum—2
Kennedy	Chafee	McClure	DeConcini		Glenn—2	Murkowski—2
Pell	Cochran	Nickles	Dodd		Heflin—2	Rudman—2
Proxmire	Cohen	Packwood	Eagleton		Hollings—2	Weicker—2
Stennis	D'Amato	Percy	Hart		Long—2	
Zorinsky	Danforth	Pressler	Huddleston		Nunn—2	
	Denton	Quayle	Inouye			
	Dole	Roth	Johnston			
	Durenberger	Simpson	Lautenberg			
	East	Specter	Leahy			
	Goldwater	Stafford	Levin			
	Grassley	Stevens	Matsunaga			
	Hatfield	Symms	Melcher			
	Hawkins	Thurmond	Metzenbaum			
	Hecht	Tower	Mitchell			
	Heinz	Trible	Moynihan			
	Helms	Wallop	Pryor			
	Humphrey	Warner	Randolph			
	Jepsen	Wilson	Riegle			
			Sarbanes			
			Sasser			
			Tsongas			

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

1—Official Business
2—Necessarily Absent
3—Illness
4—Other

SYMBOLS:

AY—Announced Yea
AN—Announced Nay
PY—Paired Yea
PN—Paired Nay

ANALYSIS OF ISSUE VOTED ON:

Party Cohesion	**Measure of Party Support on Issue as Voted on**	
	For (56)	*Against* (26)
Democrats— 72%	Democrats— 10 or 18%	Democrats— 26 or 100%
Republicans— 100%	Republicans— 46 or 82%	Republicans— 0 or 0%

Prepared and Compiled by Senate Democratic Policy Committee
Robert C. Byrd, Chairman

training, and are about to be exposed to real and potential hazards, usually beyond the 4-month point, they are entitled to a raise. It serves as an incentive and reward for finishing training. There is currently a careful mix of inducements to join the military; entry pay and advertising each have an important role to play. Recruiting is working well now; the freeze will not adversely effect it, and will not contribute to pay compression problems which do not exist at the E-1 level.

SENATE VOTING RECORD

NO. 218

98th Congress
1st Session

July 26, 1983, 6:31 p.m.
Temp. Cong. Rec. p. S-10843

DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS

BILL NO.: S. 675 **AMENDMENT NO.:** 2087

TITLE: "Omnibus Defense Authorization Act, 1984."

SUBJECT: **Hart-Hatfield amendment prohibiting the use of funds for the production, procurement, or deployment of the MX missile.** (See also Vote Nos. 113, 114, 212, and 219.)

NOTE: Proponents asserted that the MX represents a fundamental shift from the doctrine of deterrence to a war-fighting capability. Deployed in vulnerable silos with warheads capable of destroying Soviet land based missiles, the MX can only be viewed by the Soviets as a first strike weapon. It, therefore, lowers the threshhold to nuclear war because both the Soviet and U.S. land based forces would be vulnerable to a first strike which would require only 30 minutes to execute. Under such hair-trigger conditions, both sides would be tempted to launch on warning of attack. The peril to the Soviet Union would be especially acute because it depends heavily on vulnerable land based missiles since it has no comparable sea-based and bomber forces. The President's Commission, which opponents use to justify deployment of the MX, found that multiple warhead missiles (MIRV's), with accuracies sufficient to destroy an opponent's retaliatory force, do not further national security. MIRV's can destroy four to five enemy missiles at the cost of only one attacking missile and, thus, would tempt either side to destroy the other's forces preemptively in a crisis. The MX is not needed to demonstrate a national will to modernize defenses because the U.S. is already pursuing the Trident submarine, cruise missile, and B-1 and Stealth bomber programs. Such a massive program demonstrates a firm national resolve and provides ample incentives for the Soviets to negotiate an arms control agreement. The MX is also a symbol of the complacency that allows continuation of weapons that cannot perform the task for which

(OVER)

S. 675: Vote Nos. 181-195, 197-221, 244.

RESULT: **AMENDMENT REJECTED** ADMINISTRATION POSITION: NAY

YEAS (41)

Democrats
(34 or 74%)

Baucus
Biden
Bingaman
Boren
Bradley
Bumpers
Burdick
Cranston
Dixon
Dodd
Eagleton
Exon
Ford
Glenn
Hart
Hollings
Huddleston
Inouye
Kennedy
Lautenberg
Leahy
Levin
Matsunaga
Melcher
Metzenbaum
Mitchell
Moynihan
Pell
Proxmire
Pryor
Riegle
Sarbanes
Sasser
Tsongas

Republicans
(7 or 13%)

Andrews
Durenberger
Hatfield
Humphrey
Packwood
Stafford
Weicker

NAYS (58)

Democrats
(12 or 26%)

Bentsen
Byrd
Chiles
DeConcini
Heflin
Jackson
Johnston
Long
Nunn
Randolph
Stennis
Zorinsky

Republicans
(46 or 87%)

Abdnor
Armstrong
Baker
Boschwitz
Chafee
Cochran
Cohen
D'Amato
Danforth
Denton
Dole
East
Garn
Goldwater
Gorton
Grassley
Hatch
Hawkins
Hecht
Heinz
Helms
Jepsen
Kassebaum
Kasten
Laxalt
Lugar
Mathias
Mattingly
McClure
Murkowski
Nickles
Percy
Pressler
Quayle
Roth
Rudman
Simpson
Specter
Stevens
Symms
Thurmond
Tower
Trible
Wallop
Warner
Wilson

NOT VOTING (1)

Democrats (0)

Republicans (1)

Domenici—3

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

1—Official Business
2—Necessarily Absent
3—Illness
4—Other

SYMBOLS:

AY—Announced Yea
AN—Announced Nay
PY—Paired Yea
PN—Paired Nay

ANALYSIS OF ISSUE VOTED ON:

Party Cohesion

Democrats— 74%
Republicans— 87%

Measure of Party Support on Issue as Voted on

For (41)
Democrats— 34 or 83%
Republicans— 7 or 17%

Against (58)
Democrats— 12 or 21%
Republicans— 46 or 79%

Prepared and Compiled by Senate Democratic Policy Committee
Robert C. Byrd, Chairman

they were intended. The MX was designed in the 1970's as a mobile missile to replace our silo-based forces which were threatened by increasingly accurate Soviet missiles. The MX, however, would be neither mobile nor redress the vulnerability of our land based missiles. Continuing production of questionable systems could syphon funds from readiness and conventional force modernization. Congress, therefore, must reevaluate our specific national security needs in order to ensure that increased defense spending enhances our security.

Opponents asserted that deployment of 100 Peacekeeper missiles is the absolute minimum response to the relentless Soviet strategic buildup of the 1970's. Such a deployment would strengthen deterrence by redressing the current Soviet advantage in prompt, hard-target kill capability. Introduction of only 100 such missiles, however, would not be destabilizing since they would not be sufficient for a successful first strike. The Peacekeeper is a necessary part of the U.S. arms control negotiations because on-going programs increase Soviet willingness to enter agreements that will enhance stability. For example, the ABM Treaty of 1972 came about only because the U.S. maintained an ABM program. Abandoning the MX would show a lack of will to modernize our forces and would, therefore, jeopardize the likelihood of reaching a stabilizing and equitable agreement. It would also undermine the incentives for the Soviets to change the nature of their own ICBM force and, thus, the environment most conducive to the deployment of a small, less threatening missile. Some favored MX as a component of a commitment by the President to reformulate the U.S. START negotiating position to incorporate the concept of retiring two warheads for each new one deployed and accelerating development of a single-warhead missile.

SENATE VOTING RECORD

NO. 219

98th Congress
1st Session

July 26, 1983, 6:54 p.m.
Temp. Cong. Rec. p. S-10843

DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS

BILL NO.: S. 675 **AMENDMENT NO.:** 2089

TITLE: "Omnibus Defense Authorization Act, 1983."

SUBJECT: **Moynihan amendment prohibiting the obligation or expenditure of any funds for the deployment of the MX missile; stating the sense of the Congress that efforts to modernize the land-based strategic force should be focused on a small, single-warhead ICBM that is either mobile or able to be deployed in a deceptive fashion; and requiring the President to submit a written report to Congress by March 1, 1984, detailing the prospects for operational deployment of a small, single-warhead ICBM in sufficient strength by December 1, 1986.** (See also Vote Nos. 113, 114, 212, and 218.)

NOTE: Proponents asserted that the MX represents a fundamental shift from the doctrine of deterrence to a war-fighting capability. Because the MX could not survive an attack, the Soviets could only view it as a first-strike, silo-killing weapon. It would lower the threshhold to accidental nuclear war because both the Soviet and U.S. land based forces would be vulnerable to a first strike. Without the option of riding out a first strike, both sides would be tempted to launch on warning of attack because ICBM's require only 30 minutes to hit their targets. Such a short interval to Armageddon is unacceptable considering the numerous false warnings generated through computer malfunction each year. The peril to the Soviet Union would be especially acute because they lack comparable sea-based and bomber forces and depend heavily on relatively vulnerable land based missiles. Multiple warhead missiles (MIRV's), with accuracies sufficient to destroy an opponent's retaliatory forces, do not further the national security. MIRV's can destroy four to five enemy missiles at the cost of only one attacking missile and, thus, would tempt either side to destroy the other's forces preemptively in a crisis. Congress should reject the political decision to deploy MX and accelerate development of of a single-warhead, mobile missile, which can survive a first strike.

(OVER)

S. 675: Vote Nos. 181-195, 197-221, 244.

RESULT: AMENDMENT REJECTED

YEAS (42)

Democrats (35 or 76%)

Baucus
Biden
Bingaman
Boren
Bradley
Bumpers
Burdick
Chiles
Cranston
Dixon
Dodd
Eagleton
Exon
Ford
Glenn
Hart
Hollings
Huddleston
Inouye
Kennedy
Lautenberg
Leahy
Levin
Matsunaga
Melcher
Metzenbaum
Mitchell
Moynihan
Pell
Proxmire
Pryor
Riegle
Sarbanes
Sasser
Tsongas

Republicans (7 or 13%)

Andrews
Durenberger
Hatfield
Humphrey
Packwood
Stafford
Weicker

NAYS (57)

Democrats (11 or 24%)

Bentsen
Byrd
DeConcini
Heflin
Jackson
Johnston
Long
Nunn
Randolph
Stennis
Zorinsky

Republicans (46 or 87%)

Abdnor
Armstrong
Baker
Boschwitz
Chafee
Cochran
Cohen
D'Amato
Danforth
Denton
Dole
East
Garn
Goldwater
Gorton
Grassley
Hatch
Hawkins
Hecht
Heinz
Helms
Jepsen
Kassebaum
Kasten
Laxalt
Lugar
Mathias
Mattingly
McClure
Murkowski
Nickles
Percy
Pressler
Quayle
Roth
Rudman
Simpson
Specter
Stevens
Symms
Thurmond
Tower
Trible
Wallop
Warner
Wilson

NOT VOTING (1)

Democrats (0)

Republicans (1)

Domenici—3

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

1—Official Business
2—Necessarily Absent
3—Illness
4—Other

SYMBOLS:

AY—Announced Yea
AN—Announced Nay
PY—Paired Yea
PN—Paired Nay

ANALYSIS OF ISSUE VOTED ON:

Party Cohesion

Democrats— 76%
Republicans— 87%

Measure of Party Support on Issue as Voted on

For (42)
Democrats— 35 or 83%
Republicans— 7 or 17%

Against (57)
Democrats— 11 or 19%
Republicans— 46 or 81%

Prepared and Compiled by Senate Democratic Policy Committee
Robert C. Byrd, Chairman

Opponents asserted that deployment of 100 Peacekeeper missiles is the absolute minimum response to the relentless Soviet strategic buildup of the 1970's. Such a deployment would strengthen deterrence by redressing the current Soviet advantage in prompt, hard-target kill capability. Introduction of only 100 such missiles, however, would not be destabilizing since they would not be sufficient for successful first strike. The Peacekeeper is a necessary part of the U.S. arms control negotiations because on-going programs increase Soviet willingness to enter agreements that will enhance stability. For example, the ABM Treaty of 1972 came about only because the U.S. maintained an ABM program. Abandoning the MX would show a lack of will to modernize our forces and would, therefore, jeopardize the likelihood of reaching a stabilizing and equitable agreement. It would also undermine the incentives to the Soviets to change the nature of their own ICBM force and, thus, the environment most conducive to the deployment of a small, less threatening missile. Some favored MX as a component of a commitment by the President to reformulate the U.S. START negotiating position to incorporate the concept of retiring two warheads for each new one deployed and accelerating development of a single-warhead missile.

SENATE VOTING RECORD

NO. 241

98th Congress
1st Session

August 3, 1983, 11:48 a.m.
Temp. Cong. Rec. p. S-11414

INTERIOR APPROPRIATIONS, 1984

BILL NO.: H.R. 3363

SUBJECT: **McClure appeal of the ruling of the Chair sustaining the Metzenbaum point of order that the second Committee amendment dealing with the restructuring of the finances and the capital assets base of the Washington Public Power Supply System (WPPSS) is out of order as legislation on an appropriations bill. The question is: "Shall the ruling of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Senate?"**

NOTE: Proponents of sustaining the Chair's ruling stated that the Committee amendment would create a new entity authorized to borrow almost $1 billion and, therefore, should not be considered on an appropriations bill. In the last 10 years, the Bonneville Power Authority (BPA), which administers WPPSS, has only repaid $42 million of a $7.8 billion debt, they pointed out, and has made no payments since 1980. Further delay of repayment and the authorization of an additional $1 billion loan at Federally-subsidized interest rates will only result in additional costs to American taxpayers who have already been "shorted" by $780 million to $1.4 billion, according to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. Since GAO has affirmed the BPA's right to use rate revenues to complete construction of unit 2, the project will be able to proceed on schedule for at least four to six months, and a funding emergency no longer exists. More time is needed to examine the specifics of the amendment and to determine its legal ramifications including whether new bond holders will hold preferential positions over current bond holders in recovering their investment.

(OVER)

H.R. 3363: Vote No. 241, 254-259.

RESULT: **DECISION OF CHAIR NOT SUSTAINED**

YEAS (40)

Democrats (32 or 71%)

Bentsen
Biden
Bingaman
Bradley
Bumpers
Burdick
Byrd
Chiles
Cranston
DeConcini
Dixon
Dodd
Eagleton
Hart
Hollings
Kennedy
Lautenberg
Leahy
Levin
Long
Matsunaga
Melcher
Metzenbaum
Mitchell
Nunn
Pell
Proxmire
Pryor
Riegle
Sarbanes
Sasser
Tsongas

Republicans (8 or 15%)

Durenberger
Hawkins
Helms
Humphrey
Packwood
Trible
Warner
Weicker

NAYS (57)

Democrats (13 or 29%)

Baucus
Boren
Exon
Ford
Heflin
Huddleston
Inouye
Jackson
Johnston
Moynihan
Randolph
Stennis
Zorinsky

Republicans (44 or 85%)

Abdnor
Andrews
Armstrong
Baker
Boschwitz
Chafee
Cochran
Cohen
D'Amato
Danforth
Denton
Dole
Domenici
East
Garn
Gorton
Grassley
Hatch
Hatfield
Hecht
Heinz
Jepsen
Kassebaum
Laxalt
Lugar
Mathias
Mattingly
McClure
Murkowski
Nickles
Percy
Pressler
Quayle
Roth
Rudman
Simpson
Specter
Stafford
Stevens
Symms
Thurmond
Tower
Wallop
Wilson

NOT VOTING (3)

Democrats (1)

Glenn—2

Republicans (2)

Goldwater—2
Kasten—2AY

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

1—Official Business
2—Necessarily Absent
3—Illness
4—Other

SYMBOLS:

AY—Announced Yea
AN—Announced Nay
PY—Paired Yea
PN—Paired Nay

ANALYSIS OF ISSUE VOTED ON:

Party Cohesion

Democrats— 71%
Republicans— 85%

Measure of Party Support on Issue as Voted on

For (40)
Democrats— 32 or 80%
Republicans— 8 or 20%

Against (57)
Democrats— 13 or 23%
Republicans— 44 or 77%

Prepared and Compiled by Senate Democratic Policy Committee
Robert C. Byrd, Chairman

Opponents of sustaining the Chair's ruling declared that ample historical precedent existed to protect the oversight of the BPA by the Appropriations Committee. · The net billing agreements, which established the BPA's authority over WPPSS, were approved in the appropriations process, and GAO has ruled this procedure legal. The amendment does not create a new entity, they maintained, but merely clarifies, with specific limitations and directives, the BPA's authority to contract with a new entity for alternative financing to complete the construction of WPPSS 2 and 3. The WPPSS project has been devastated by inflation, cost overruns, and mismanagement, and Bonneville urgently needs the authority to seek additional financing to finish units 2 and 3, which are 98 percent and 78 percent complete, respectively. It is in the best interest of all concerned to finish the projects in the most expeditious manner possible with the least loss to bond holders, ratepayers, and U.S. taxpayers. Delay will only cause increased construction costs and additional financial burden, whereas if unit 3 is quickly completed additional revenues will be earned which can be used to reduce the financial burden on ratepayers and to begin repayment of the BPA's debts. If the WPPSS plants are not completed, ratepayers could end up with three terminated plants, a multi-billion dollar debt, and a shortage of power within the decade. The Treasury has no objection to the amendment and all costs will be borne under the existing ratemaking structure and the Congressionally-approved net billing agreements. Other opponents stated that the substantive issue should be separately debated from this vote to maintain oversight of WPPSS and the BPA by the Appropriations Committee, which they supported.

SENATE VOTING RECORD

NO. 252

98th Congress
1st Session

September 15, 1983, 5:10 p.m.
Temp. Cong. Rec. p. S-12327

KOREAN AIRLINER DESTRUCTION

BILL NO.: H.J. Res. 353 **AMENDMENT NO:** 2134

SUBJECT: **Baker motion to table the Huddleston, et al, amendment to reduce substantially the Soviet official presence within the U.S., excluding persons attached to the UN, in order to establish real equivalence with the official U.S. presence in the Soviet Union.**

NOTE: Proponents of the amendment stated that it should be passed irrespective of the Soviet downing of the Korean airliner but would also be a legitimate and effective protest against this brutal action without endangering the ability of the two nations to maintain diplomatic relations. The Soviet Union has approximately 461 government employees assigned to the U.S., exclusive of their UN entourage, while only 300 U.S. government employees are stationed there. The FBI estimates that 40 percent of the Soviet representatives are trained intelligence officers of the KGB and GRU, the Soviet military intelligence organization. A phased reduction of the Soviet official presence in the U.S. to approximately the number of American employees in the USSR would not only be a strong signal of American outrage over the KAL 7 incident, but would clearly inhibit the Soviet intelligence operation in this country, whose presence creates direct and immediate danger to our national security. The USSR should not object to an action which merely enforces the normal and accepted principle of reciprocity. The President should have no reason to oppose this amendment, especially since the Foreign Missions Act of 1982 already empowers and instructs him to ensure parity of diplomatic representation.

Opponents of the amendment declared that the Senate, for the first time in history, was about to declare another government's behavior to be a crime. This strong action should not be diluted with extraneous matters or needlessly delayed. The amendment is unnecessary since the President is already legally required to demand equivalent diplomatic representation. The Administration, they noted, supports tabling all amendments to the resolution.

H.J. Res. 353: Vote Nos. 245-253.

RESULT: **MOTION TO TABLE AGREED TO** ADMINISTRATION POSITION: YEA

YEAS (49)

Democrats (14 or 34%)

Biden
Burdick
Byrd
Dixon
Eagleton
Hart
Matsunaga
Moynihan
Nunn
Pell
Proxmire
Sarbanes
Stennis
Tsongas

Republicans (35 or 66%)

Abdnor
Andrews
Baker
Boschwitz
Chafee
Danforth
Denton
Dole
Domenici
Durenberger
Evans
Garn
Goldwater
Gorton
Grassley
Hatch
Hatfield
Hecht
Heinz
Jepsen
Kassebaum
Lugar
Mathias
Murkowski
Percy
Quayle
Rudman
Simpson
Stafford
Stevens
Thurmond
Tower
Trible
Warner
Weicker

NAYS (45)

Democrats (27 or 66%)

Baucus
Bentsen
Bingaman
Boren
Bradley
Bumpers
Chiles
DeConcini
Dodd
Exon
Ford
Heflin
Huddleston
Inouye
Johnston
Kennedy
Lautenberg
Leahy
Levin
Melcher
Metzenbaum
Mitchell
Pryor
Randolph
Riegle
Sasser
Zorinsky

Republicans (18 or 34%)

Armstrong
Cochran
Cohen
D'Amato
East
Hawkins
Helms
Humphrey
Kasten
Mattingly
McClure
Nickles
Packwood
Roth
Specter
Symms
Wallop
Wilson

NOT VOTING (6)

Democrats (4)

Cranston—^{2}
Glenn—^{2}
Hollings—^{2}
Long—^{2}

Republicans (2)

Laxalt—^{2}
Pressler—^{2}

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

1—Official Business
2—Necessarily Absent
3—Illness
4—Other

SYMBOLS:

AY—Announced Yea
AN—Announced Nay
PY—Paired Yea
PN—Paired Nay

ANALYSIS OF ISSUE VOTED ON:

Party Cohesion

Democrats— 66%
Republicans— 66%

Measure of Party Support on Issue as Voted on

For (49)
Democrats— 14 or 29%
Republicans— 35 or 71%

Against (45)
Democrats— 27 or 60%
Republicans— 18 or 40%

Prepared and Compiled by Senate Democratic Policy Committee
Robert C. Byrd, Chairman

SENATE VOTING RECORD

NO. 255

98th Congress
1st Session

September 20, 1983, 5:17 p.m.
Temp. Cong. Rec. p. S-12507

INTERIOR APPROPRIATIONS, 1984

BILL NO.: H.R. 3363 **AMENDMENT NO.:** 2166

SUBJECT: **Bradley-Melcher amendment appropriating an additional $370 million for planning, construction, and administration of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve (SPR) to continue construction of the Big Hill Storage Facility (on budget) and an additional $982 million (off budget) for SPR petroleum acquisition for a fill rate of 220,000 barrels per day instead of 145,000 barrels per day as funded in the bill.**

NOTE: Proponents noted that funding for the Big Hill, Texas, storage facility had already passed both Houses in the supplemental appropriations bill but had been dropped by conferees upon the urging of the Administration. This amendment would bring the Senate bill in line with the House for Big Hill construction and a 220,000 fill rate. There are many reasons requiring the action: the U.S. is vulnerable to another oil supply disruption which could easily result from an escalation of the Iran-Iraq war; oil prices will never be significantly lower; and our national security requires the added insurance of having sufficient stockpiled oil.

While many opponents had supported such a fill rate in the past, they opposed it now given the reality of the current deficits of over $200 billion. Adding to the budget for SPR would necessitate cutting defense spending, which they found unacceptable. Oil prices, some maintained, may go even lower. Even if prices remain the same, the cost for storage would more than make up for having to pay a higher price in the future. The U.S. is much less reliant on OPEC for oil and, therefore, less vulnerable to a disruption. This language, they argued, represents a hard fought compromise with the Administration that wanted only a 100,000 a year fill rate. The Administration finally agreed, however, to 145,000 barrels per day to full capacity by fiscal 1988, and this compromise should not be jeopardized.

H.R. 3363: Vote Nos. 241, 254-259.

RESULT: **AMENDMENT AGREED TO**

YEAS (54)

Democrats (42 or 95%)

Baucus
Bentsen
Biden
Bingaman
Boren
Bradley
Bumpers
Burdick
Byrd
Chiles
Cranston
DeConcini
Dodd
Eagleton
Exon
Ford
Glenn
Hart
Heflin
Hollings
Huddleston
Johnston
Kennedy
Lautenberg
Leahy
Levin
Long
Matsunaga
Melcher
Metzenbaum
Mitchell
Moynihan
Nunn
Pell
Pryor
Randolph
Riegle
Sarbanes
Sasser
Stennis
Tsongas
Zorinsky

Republicans (12 or 23%)

Andrews
Chafee
Cohen
D'Amato
Danforth
Durenberger
Heinz
Mathias
Packwood
Rudman
Specter
Weicker

NAYS (43)

Democrats (2 or 5%)

Dixon
Proxmire

Republicans (41 or 77%)

Abdnor
Armstrong
Boschwitz
Cochran
Denton
Dole
Domenici
East
Evans
Garn
Goldwater
Gorton
Grassley
Hatch
Hatfield
Hawkins
Hecht
Helms
Humphrey
Jepsen
Kassebaum
Kasten
Laxalt
Lugar
Mattingly
McClure
Murkowski
Nickles
Percy
Pressler
Quayle
Roth
Simpson
Stafford
Stevens
Symms
Tower
Trible
Wallop
Warner
Wilson

NOT VOTING (3)

Democrats (1)

Inouye—2

Republicans (2)

Baker—2
Thurmond—2AN

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

1—Official Business
2—Necessarily Absent
3—Illness
4—Other

SYMBOLS:

AY—Announced Yea
AN—Announced Nay
PY—Paired Yea
PN—Paired Nay

ANALYSIS OF ISSUE VOTED ON:

Party Cohesion	**Measure of Party Support on Issue as Voted on**	
	For (54)	*Against* (43)
Democrats— 95%	Democrats— 42 or 78%	Democrats— 2 or 5%
Republicans— 77%	Republicans— 12 or 22%	Republicans— 41 or 95%

Prepared and Compiled by Senate Democratic Policy Committee
Robert C. Byrd, Chairman

SENATE VOTING RECORD

NO. 260

98th Congress
1st Session

September 21, 1983, 5:50 p.m.
Temp. Cong. Rec. p. S-12608

REVENUE SHARING

BILL NO.: S. 1426 (H.R. 2780) **AMENDMENT NO.:** 2180

TITLE: "State and Local Fiscal Assistance Amendments of 1983."

SUBJECT: **Moynihan, et al, amendment increasing the authorization of entitlements for local governments for the next three fiscal years from $4,566,700,000 to $5,017,000,000—a $450 million increase to put funding at the Budget Resolution level.** (See also Vote No. 261.)

NOTE: Proponents noted that this amendment merely funds the revenue sharing program at the level provided for in the Budget Resolution. Funding for the program has remained at the same level since 1977, despite a 40 percent decline in the real dollar value. This bill would extend the freeze through 1986 even though State and local governments are being confronted with increasing demands for public services and decreasing monies because of Federal aid cuts, high unemployment, and a deteriorating economy. They desperately need a quick infusion of funding to relieve their current fiscal crises and enable them to maintain essential services. Revenue sharing is the most effective vehicle for returning Federal tax dollars to communities, they asserted, and it is one of the most successful and cost-effective Federal programs. Some proponents supported the increase because it would trigger a provision in the bill (later deleted by voice vote) to revise the allocation formula and target funds to areas hardest hit by the recession and unemployment.

Opponents contended that budget resolution levels are meant to be limitations, not targets, and that a fiscally responsible Senate should defeat this amendment. The Budget Committee puts in spending items, they complained, and expects the Finance Committee, which defeated this amendment by a vote of 12 to 6, to raise taxes to pay for them. This important program deserves increased funding, some opponents asserted, if we could afford it. Congress must continue to restrain spending and reduce the massive Federal deficit. Most revenue sharing recipients, they contended, are satisfied with current funding and are more concerned about the program being reauthorized. The President has threatened to veto the bill if funding is increased. Others voiced their fear that an increase in this non-means tested entitlement would lead to cuts in other Federal programs vital to the nation's neediest citizens.

S. 1426 (H.R. 2780): Vote Nos. 260-262.

RESULT: AMENDMENT REJECTED

YEAS (30)

Democrats (29 or 71%)

Biden
Bingaman
Bradley
Bumpers
Burdick
Byrd
Glenn
Hart
Heflin
Huddleston
Inouye
Johnston
Kennedy
Lautenberg
Leahy
Levin
Long
Matsunaga
Melcher
Metzenbaum
Mitchell
Moynihan
Pell
Pryor
Randolph
Riegle
Sarbanes
Sasser
Tsongas

Republicans (1 or 2%)

D'Amato

NAYS (64)

Democrats (12 or 29%)

Baucus
Bentsen
Boren
Chiles
DeConcini
Dixon
Eagleton
Exon
Ford
Nunn
Proxmire
Zorinsky

Republicans (52 or 98%)

Abdnor
Andrews
Armstrong
Baker
Boschwitz
Chafee
Cochran
Cohen
Danforth
Denton
Dole
Domenici
Durenberger
East
Evans
Garn
Gorton
Grassley
Hatch
Hatfield
Hawkins
Hecht
Heinz
Helms
Humphrey
Jepsen
Kassebaum
Kasten
Laxalt
Lugar
Mattingly
McClure
Murkowski
Nickles
Packwood
Percy
Pressler
Quayle
Roth
Rudman
Simpson
Specter
Stafford
Stevens
Symms
Thurmond
Tower
Trible
Wallop
Warner
Weicker
Wilson

NOT VOTING (6)

Democrats (4)

Cranston—2
Dodd—2
Hollings—2
Stennis—2

Republicans (2)

Goldwater—2
Mathias—2

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

1—Official Business
2—Necessarily Absent
3—Illness
4—Other

SYMBOLS:

AY—Announced Yea
AN—Announced Nay
PY—Paired Yea
PN—Paired Nay

ANALYSIS OF ISSUE VOTED ON:

Party Cohesion

Democrats— 71%
Republicans— 98%

Measure of Party Support on Issue as Voted on

For (30)
Democrats— 29 or 97%
Republicans— 1 or 3%

Against (64)
Democrats— 12 or 19%
Republicans— 52 or 81%

Prepared and Compiled by Senate Democratic Policy Committee
Robert C. Byrd, Chairman

SENATE VOTING RECORD

NO. 261

98th Congress
1st Session

September 21, 1983, 6:25 p.m.
Temp. Cong. Rec. p. S-12610

REVENUE SHARING

BILL NO.: S. 1426 (H.R. 2780) **AMENDMENT NO.:** 2181

TITLE: "State and Local Fiscal Assistance Amendments of 1983."

SUBJECT: **Bradley, et al, amendment increasing the authorization for entitlements for local governments for the next three fiscal years from $4,566,700,00 to $4,791,700,000—a $225 million increase.** (See also Vote No. 260.)

NOTE: Proponents stated that this amendment provides a modest, long overdue increase for the revenue sharing program. Its funding has remained at the same level since 1977, despite a 40 percent decline in real dollar value. This bill would extend the freeze through 1986 even though State and local governments are being confronted with increasing demands for public services and decreasing monies because of Federal aid cuts, high unemployment, and a deteriorating economy. They desperately need a quick infusion of funding to relieve their current fiscal crises and enable them to maintain essential services. This amendment addresses the plight of State and local governments yet meets the need for Federal fiscal responsibility. Revenue sharing is the most effective vehicle for returning Federal tax dollars to communities, they asserted, and it is one of the most successful and cost-effective Federal programs. Some proponents supported the increase because it would trigger a provision in the bill (later deleted by voice vote) to revise the allocation formula and target funds to areas hardest hit by the recession and unemployment.

Opponents complained that this amendment simply means a deficit increase of an additional $675 million instead of $1.3 billion as proposed in the amendment just defeated (Vote No. 260). This important program deserves increased funding, some opponents asserted, if we could afford it. Congress must continue to restrain spending and reduce the massive Federal deficit. Most revenue sharing recipients, they contended, are satisfied with current funding and are more concerned about the program being reauthorized. The President has threatened to veto the bill if funding is increased. Others voiced their fear that an increase in this non-means tested entitlement would lead to cuts in other Federal programs vital to the nation's neediest citizens.

S. 1426 (H.R. 2780): Vote Nos. 260-262.

RESULT: **AMENDMENT REJECTED**

YEAS (36)

Democrats (32 or 78%)

Biden
Bingaman
Bradley
Bumpers
Burdick
Byrd
Dixon
Eagleton
Ford
Glenn
Hart
Heflin
Huddleston
Inouye
Johnston
Kennedy
Lautenberg
Leahy
Levin
Long
Matsunaga
Melcher
Metzenbaum
Mitchell
Moynihan
Pell
Pryor
Randolph
Riegle
Sarbanes
Sasser
Tsongas

Republicans (4 or 8%)

Cohen
D'Amato
Hawkins
Weicker

NAYS (58)

Democrats (9 or 22%)

Baucus
Bentsen
Boren
Chiles
DeConcini
Exon
Nunn
Proxmire
Zorinsky

Republicans (49 or 92%)

Abdnor
Andrews
Armstrong
Baker
Boschwitz
Chafee
Cochran
Danforth
Denton
Dole
Domenici
Durenberger
East
Evans
Garn
Gorton
Grassley
Hatch
Hatfield
Hecht
Heinz
Helms
Humphrey
Jepsen
Kassebaum
Kasten
Laxalt
Lugar
Mattingly
McClure
Murkowski
Nickles
Packwood
Percy
Pressler
Quayle
Roth
Rudman
Simpson
Specter
Stafford
Stevens
Symms
Thurmond
Tower
Trible
Wallop
Warner
Wilson

NOT VOTING (6)

Democrats (4)

Cranston—2
Dodd—2
Hollings—2
Stennis—2

Republicans (2)

Goldwater—2
Mathias—2

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

1—Official Business
2—Necessarily Absent
3—Illness
4—Other

SYMBOLS:

AY—Announced Yea
AN—Announced Nay
PY—Paired Yea
PN—Paired Nay

ANALYSIS OF ISSUE VOTED ON:

Party Cohesion

Democrats— 78%
Republicans— 92%

Measure of Party Support on Issue as Voted on

For (36)
Democrats— 32 or 89%
Republicans— 4 or 11%

Against (58)
Democrats— 9 or 16%
Republicans— 49 or 84%

Prepared and Compiled by Senate Democratic Policy Committee
Robert C. Byrd, Chairman

SENATE VOTING RECORD

NO. 269

98th Congress
1st Session

September 29, 1983, 11:30 a.m.
Temp. Cong. Rec. p. S-13138

LEBANON MULTINATIONAL FORCE/WAR POWERS

BILL NO.: S.J. Res. 159 **AMENDMENT NO.:** 2231

TITLE: "Multinational Force in Lebanon Resolution."

SUBJECT: **Baker motion to table the Byrd, et al, modified substitute amendment requiring the President, within 48 hours after enactment of this resolution, to submit to the Speaker of the House and the President Pro Tempore of the Senate a report containing the information required by paragraphs A-C of sec. 4 (a) of the War Powers Resolution (the circumstances necessitating the introduction of U.S. troops into Lebanon, the constitutional and legislative authority for their introduction, and the estimated scope and duration of the hostilities or their involvement) together with the following information describing: the specific goals of U.S. policy in Lebanon, the specific roles and missions of the U.S. forces in Lebanon, and the specific criteria that are being applied to determine when they have accomplished their roles and missions; providing for expedited procedures, upon receipt of the report, of any resolution relating to U.S. forces in Lebanon; and extending for 60 days the 60-day period specified in sec. 5(b) of the War Powers Resolution.**

NOTE: Proponents of the amendment asserted that it is simple and straightforward. If the President submits the required reports providing the information Congress needs to make an informed, rational judgment about continued troop deployment, the original 60-day deployment period, which began on August 31, 1983, will be extended for 60 days from the date of enactment, giving him another opportunity to comply with the law. The War Powers Resolution veto in 1973 was overridden by super majorities in both Houses; it is not up to this President to pass judgment on its legitimacy. The Constitution requires the President to carry out the law until it should be ruled unconstitutional by the

(OVER)

S.J. Res. 159: Vote Nos. 269-274.

RESULT: **MOTION TO TABLE AGREED TO**

YEAS (55)

Democrats (0 or 0%)

Republicans (55 or 100%)

Abdnor
Andrews
Armstrong
Baker
Boschwitz
Chafee
Cochran
Cohen
D'Amato
Danforth
Denton
Dole
Domenici
Durenberger
East
Evans
Garn
Goldwater
Gorton
Grassley
Hatch
Hatfield
Hawkins
Hecht
Heinz
Helms
Humphrey
Jepsen
Kassebaum
Kasten
Laxalt
Lugar
Mathias
Mattingly
McClure
Murkowski
Nickles
Packwood
Percy
Pressler
Quayle
Roth
Rudman
Simpson
Specter
Stafford
Stevens
Symms
Thurmond
Tower
Trible
Wallop
Warner
Weicker
Wilson

NAYS (45)

Democrats (45 or 100%)

Baucus
Bentsen
Biden
Bingaman
Boren
Bradley
Bumpers
Burdick
Byrd
Chiles
Cranston
DeConcini
Dixon
Dodd
Eagleton
Exon
Ford
Glenn
Hart
Heflin
Hollings
Huddleston
Inouye
Johnston
Kennedy
Lautenberg
Leahy
Levin
Long
Matsunaga
Melcher
Metzenbaum
Mitchell
Moynihan
Nunn
Pell
Proxmire
Pryor
Randolph
Riegle
Sarbanes
Sasser
Stennis
Tsongas
Zorinsky

Republicans (0 or 0%)

NOT VOTING (0)

ANALYSIS OF ISSUE VOTED ON:

Party Cohesion	**Measure of Party Support on Issue as Voted on**	
	For (55)	*Against* (45)
Democrats— 100%	Democrats— 0 or 0%	Democrats— 45 or 100%
Republicans— 100%	Republicans— 55 or 100%	Republicans— 0 or 0%

Prepared and Compiled by Senate Democratic Policy Committee
Robert C. Byrd, Chairman

Supreme Court. By setting forth the procedures by which the power of Congress alone to declare war is balanced against the constitutional responsibility of the President to act as Commander in Chief, the War Powers Resolution is meant to prevent the occurrence of undeclared wars. The overriding issue is the constitutional balance of power between the legislative and executive branches which transcends the question of the duration that U.S. troops shall remain in Lebanon. If the War Powers Resolution is not upheld in this instance, Congress will have no protection in Central America, or in any other part of the globe. A carte blanche authorization—a sort of Tonkin Gulf resolution—should not be given to the President who has not complied with the law and who has either not defined a specific mission for the Marines to fulfill or is unwilling to share it with Congress. The August 1982 Marine mission, to facilitate the PLO withdrawal from Beirut, was limited and attainable. In contrast, their reentry into Beirut on September 25, 1982, was under an agreement with Lebanese authorities "temporarily to establish an environment which will permit the Lebanese Armed Forces to carry out their responsibilities in the Beirut area." Later that week, the President assured Congress that the limit of the Marine mission was "to provide an interposition force at agreed locations and, therefore, provide the multinational presence requested by the Lebanese Government." On August 30, 1983, however, the President reported to Congress that the Marines' role in the multinational force was "designed to facilitate the restoration of the Lebanese Government's sovereignty and authority"—a worthy diplomatic goal but an absurd military mission. Proponents questioned the ability of the Lebanese Gemayel government to establish and maintain its authority outside Beirut, and challenged the ability of the multinational force to bring peace to a country as unstable as Lebanon. The goals set out in the resolution are even broader than those enunciated by the Administration. The so-called compromise before the Senate condones the President's silence with respect to Congress' demands for a policy statement. It is not a bipartisan effort in the Senate—Senate Democrats have consistently opposed it. It was devised to help the Administration avoid invoking the War Powers Act. The President has no intention of abiding by this resolution: his letter to Congress of September 27 clearly demonstrates it, and Secretary of State Shultz has testified to that effect. Without this amendment, the President will escape accountability both to Congress and to the electorate, since an 18 month extension would deny Congress the opportunity to review the conduct of policy in this area until after the 1984 elections.

Some opponents of the amendment questioned the constitutionality of the War Powers Resolution and argued that the Democratic Caucus proposal is an attempt to usurp the reins of military direction from the President. They asserted that the responsibility of the legislative branch is simply to advise and consent on matters of foreign policy, not to formulate or dictate such policy. Others supported the principles of the War Powers Resolution but urged support for the underlying resolution which they described as a delicate bipartisan compromise between the executive branch and the leaders of the House and Senate. If a period shorter than 18 months had been authorized in Committee, they maintained, the broad principles of the War Powers Act might have been abandoned before they could be considered on the floor. Although the resolution essentially postpones constitutional questions, it has some important strengths: it sets an important precedent and creates crucial legislative history, it requires reports to Congress every 3 months, and provides expedited procedures for changes in the authorization. The amendment, however, is unnecessary: it would only cause delay and communicate indecision which would almost inevitably result in more violence in and around Beirut. Furthermore, the President is unlikely to sign a resolution thus amended. He described his objectives, although in abbreviated form, in his report to Congress, and they were further outlined in testimony by Secretary Shultz. The presence of the Multinational Force prevented imminent deterioration in Lebanon and contributed to the September 25 ceasefire and initation of negotiations. These tentative first steps toward national reconciliation underscore the importance of the Marine's limited peacekeeping mission. If the Armed Forces are placed under deadline, with the clear implication that they will be withdrawn after that date, then those who may profit from chaos and conflict will know they have only to wait and to act more determinedly. Prospects for peace and stability in the Middle East will suffer, as will the vital interest of the U.S., its allies, and all those who depend on oil from that region. They urged the Senate not to undercut the successes already achieved.

SENATE VOTING RECORD

NO. 270

98th Congress
1st Session

September 29, 1983, 12:23 p.m.
Temp. Cong. Rec. p. S-13143

LEBANON MULTINATIONAL FORCE/WAR POWERS

BILL NO.: S.J. Res. 159 **AMENDMENT NO.:** 2228

TITLE: "Multinational Force in Lebanon Resolution."

SUBJECT: **Baker motion to table the Pell-Dixon amendment to shorten the authorized period of participation of U.S. Armed Forces in the Multinational Peacekeeping Force in Lebanon from 18 to 6 months.**

NOTE: Proponents of the amendment argued that it would make the Baker-Percy resolution acceptable to more Senators by allaying fears emanating from memories of the Vietnam War, and especially from the Gulf of Tonkin resolution. A number of committee votes indicated that many members favor a shorter authorization. According to a recent poll, 58 percent of the American public support a commitment of 6 months or less; while only 29 percent favor a longer commitment. Even an 18-month stay could not guarantee stability for Lebanon which has not known peace this century except for the brief period between World Wars I and II. Although it has been argued that Lebanon's adversaries would simply wait out the Marines' 6-month stay, proponents maintained that parties to this dispute who prefer the status quo will not make their best efforts to reconcile if they have 18 months. In addition, Congress should display a continuing sense of responsibility if the Marines are to stay, should insist on periodic review of the military's role in Lebanon at intervals short enough to permit quick reaction to changed circumstances, and should refuse to give the President a virtual blank check to keep the armed forces in Lebanon until 1985.

(OVER)

S.J. Res. 159: Vote Nos. 269-274.

RESULT: MOTION TO TABLE AGREED TO

YEAS (62)

Democrats (8 or 18%)

Biden
Chiles
Dodd
Exon
Hart
Mitchell
Nunn
Sasser

Republicans (54 or 98%)

Abdnor
Andrews
Armstrong
Baker
Boschwitz
Chafee
Cochran
Cohen
D'Amato
Danforth
Denton
Dole
Domenici
Durenberger
East
Evans
Garn
Goldwater
Gorton
Grassley
Hatch
Hatfield
Hawkins
Hecht
Heinz
Helms
Humphrey
Jepsen
Kassebaum
Kasten
Laxalt
Lugar
Mattingly
McClure
Murkowski
Nickles
Packwood
Percy
Pressler
Quayle
Roth
Rudman
Simpson
Specter
Stafford
Stevens
Symms
Thurmond
Tower
Trible
Wallop
Warner
Weicker
Wilson

NAYS (38)

Democrats (37 or 82%)

Baucus
Bentsen
Bingaman
Boren
Bradley
Bumpers
Burdick
Byrd
Cranston
DeConcini
Dixon
Eagleton
Ford
Glenn
Heflin
Hollings
Huddleston
Inouye
Johnston
Kennedy
Lautenberg
Leahy
Levin
Long
Matsunaga
Melcher
Metzenbaum
Moynihan
Pell
Proxmire
Pryor
Randolph
Riegle
Sarbanes
Stennis
Tsongas
Zorinsky

Republicans (1 or 2%)

Mathias

NOT VOTING (0)

ANALYSIS OF ISSUE VOTED ON:

Party Cohesion

Democrats— 82%
Republicans— 98%

Measure of Party Support on Issue as Voted on

For (62)
Democrats— 8 or 13%
Republicans— 54 or 87%

Against (38)
Democrats— 37 or 97%
Republicans— 1 or 3%

Prepared and Compiled by Senate Democratic Policy Committee
Robert C. Byrd, Chairman

Opponents contended that the Founding Fathers did not intend for Congress to intervene so actively in the conduct of foreign policy. The President should have as much flexibility as possible to carry out a coherent foreign policy unencumbered by domestic political considerations or popular whim. Putting Congressional timetables in this resolution would jeopardize Marines' lives, probably mean that the U.S. cannot be a credible part of any multinational force again, and render the U.S. irrelevant to the peacemaking process in the Middle East. They challenged the comparison to the Gulf of Tonkin resolution, pointing to limitations in this resolution and commitments from the President to seek Congressional authorization if the Marines' role or number are to be substantially expanded. Others argued that the amendment was irrelevant because it focused on timing rather than mission.

SENATE VOTING RECORD

NO. 271

98th Congress
1st Session

September 29, 1983, 1:14 p.m.
Temp. Cong. Rec. p. S-13147

LEBANON MULTINATIONAL FORCE/WAR POWERS

BILL NO.: S.J. Res. 159 **AMENDMENT NO.:** 2239

TITLE: "Multinational Force in Lebanon Resolution."

SUBJECT: **Baker motion to table the Tsongas amendment modifying the finding of Congress that the U.S. is participating in the Multinational Force in Lebanon in order to "restore full control by the Government of Lebanon over its own territory" to state that such participation is in order to "maintain a secure area from which the Government of Lebanon can restore full control."**

NOTE: Proponents of the amendment argued that it is necessary to affirm in the legislative history, the geographical limitation to the Beirut area referred to repeatedly in the letters exchanged between the governments of the U.S. and Lebanon regarding Multinational Force participation. Eight times in each letter military activity is limited to the Beirut area, yet Secretary Shultz's testimony before the Foreign Relations Committee and the resolution itself refer to Lebanon as a whole. Others argued that since the Marines' mission is still ambiguous, even this limiting amendment cannot improve such a fatally flawed piece of legislation.
No statements were made in opposition to the amendment.

S.J. Res. 159: Vote Nos. 269-274.

RESULT: **MOTION TO TABLE AGREED TO**

YEAS (56)

Democrats (3 or 7%)

Boren
Mitchell
Zorinsky

Republicans (53 or 98%)

Abdnor
Andrews
Armstrong
Baker
Boschwitz
Chafee
Cochran
Cohen
D'Amato
Danforth
Denton
Dole
Domenici
Durenberger
East
Evans
Garn
Goldwater
Gorton
Grassley
Hatch
Hatfield
Hawkins
Hecht
Heinz
Helms
Humphrey
Jepsen
Kassebaum
Kasten
Laxalt
Lugar
Mattingly
McClure
Murkowski
Nickles
Packwood
Percy
Pressler
Quayle
Roth
Rudman
Simpson
Stafford
Stevens
Symms
Thurmond
Tower
Trible
Wallop
Warner
Weicker
Wilson

NAYS (42)

Democrats (41 or 93%)

Baucus
Bentsen
Biden
Bingaman
Bradley
Bumpers
Burdick
Byrd
Chiles
Cranston
DeConcini
Dixon
Dodd
Eagleton
Exon
Ford
Glenn
Hart
Heflin
Hollings
Huddleston
Johnston
Kennedy
Lautenberg
Leahy
Levin
Long
Matsunaga
Melcher
Metzenbaum
Moynihan
Nunn
Pell
Proxmire
Pryor
Randolph
Riegle
Sarbanes
Sasser
Stennis
Tsongas

Republicans (1 or 2%)

Specter

NOT VOTING (2)

Democrats (1)

Inouye—[2]

Republicans (1)

Mathias—[2]

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

1—Official Business
2—Necessarily Absent
3—Illness
4—Other

SYMBOLS:

AY—Announced Yea
AN—Announced Nay
PY—Paired Yea
PN—Paired Nay

ANALYSIS OF ISSUE VOTED ON:

Party Cohesion	**Measure of Party Support on Issue as Voted on**	
	For (56)	*Against* (42)
Democrats— 93%	Democrats— 3 or 5%	Democrats— 41 or 98%
Republicans— 98%	Republicans— 53 or 95%	Republicans— 1 or 2%

Prepared and Compiled by Senate Democratic Policy Committee
Robert C. Byrd, Chairman

SENATE VOTING RECORD

NO. 272

98th Congress
1st Session

September 29, 1983, 1:43 p.m.
Temp. Cong. Rec. p. S-13149

LEBANON MULTINATIONAL FORCE/WAR POWERS

BILL NO.: S.J. Res. 159

AMENDMENT NO.: 2240

TITLE: "Multinational Force in Lebanon Resolution."

SUBJECT: **Baker motion to table the Levin-Randolph amendment to include in the resolution a declaration instead of a Congressional finding that actual or imminent hostilities involving U.S. Armed Forces came into being on August 29, 1983.**

NOTE: Proponents of the amendment pointed out that the resolution before the Senate only asserts that the Congress declares hostilities to exist which is very different from stating it as a matter of fact. This seemingly minor difference could prove to be crucial in focusing any court test on constitutional grounds rather than the limited issue of the existence of hostilities. If the President affixes his signature to language which asserts that Congress declares hostilities exist, he is not necessarily agreeing with that statement which goes to the heart of the question of whether War Powers Act procedures should be triggered. Thus, the amendment eliminates an escape which a dispute about whether hostilities existed might provide.

While praising the substance of the amendment, opponents noted that the statutory time for a vote was fast approaching, and that the House leadership had expressed unwillingness to bargain over any differences with the Senate. Adoption of the amendment, they contended, would result in no bill being cleared for the White House.

S.J. Res. 159: Vote Nos. 269-274.

RESULT: MOTION TO TABLE AGREED TO

YEAS (54)

Democrats (0 or 0%)

Republicans (54 or 100%)

Abdnor
Andrews
Armstrong
Baker
Boschwitz
Chafee
Cochran
Cohen
D'Amato
Danforth
Denton
Dole
Domenici
Durenberger
East
Evans
Garn
Goldwater
Gorton
Grassley
Hatch
Hatfield
Hawkins
Hecht
Heinz
Helms
Humphrey
Jepsen
Kasten
Laxalt
Lugar
Mathias
Mattingly
McClure
Murkowski
Nickles
Packwood
Percy
Pressler
Quayle
Roth
Rudman
Simpson
Specter
Stafford
Stevens
Symms
Thurmond
Tower
Trible
Wallop
Warner
Weicker
Wilson

NAYS (45)

Democrats (45 or 100%)

Baucus
Bentsen
Biden
Bingaman
Boren
Bradley
Bumpers
Burdick
Byrd
Chiles
Cranston
DeConcini
Dixon
Dodd
Eagleton
Exon
Ford
Glenn
Hart
Heflin
Hollings
Huddleston
Inouye
Johnston
Kennedy
Lautenberg
Leahy
Levin
Long
Matsunaga
Melcher
Metzenbaum
Mitchell
Moynihan
Nunn
Pell
Proxmire
Pryor
Randolph
Riegle
Sarbanes
Sasser
Stennis
Tsongas
Zorinsky

Republicans (0 or 0%)

NOT VOTING (1)

Democrats (0)

Republicans (1)

Kassebaum—2

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

1—Official Business
2—Necessarily Absent
3—Illness
4—Other

SYMBOLS:

AY—Announced Yea
AN—Announced Nay
PY—Paired Yea
PN—Paired Nay

ANALYSIS OF ISSUE VOTED ON:

Party Cohesion

Democrats— 100%
Republicans— 100%

Measure of Party Support on Issue as Voted on

For (54)
Democrats— 0 or 0%
Republicans— 54 or 100%

Against (45)
Democrats— 45 or 100%
Republicans— 0 or 0%

Prepared and Compiled by Senate Democratic Policy Committee
Robert C. Byrd, Chairman

SENATE VOTING RECORD

NO. 273

98th Congress
1st Session

September 29. 1983. 2:04 p.m.
Temp. Cong. Rec. p. S-13149

LEBANON MULTINATIONAL FORCE/WAR POWERS

BILL NO.: S.J. Res. 159 **AMENDMENT NO.:** 2233

TITLE: "Multinational Force in Lebanon Resolution."

SUBJECT: **Baker motion to table the Eagleton amendment substituting the word "defensive" for the word "protective" in sec. 3 so that the exception to the limitations on the functions of the U.S. forces in Lebanon, as set forth in the exchange of letters between the U.S. and Lebanon, would read "except that this shall not preclude such defensive measures as may be necessary to ensure the safety of Multinational Forces in Lebanon"; and requiring the President to include in his reports due every three months to Congress "the results of efforts to secure removal of all foreign forces from Lebanon and to restore full control by the government of Lebanon over its own territory".**

NOTE: Proponents of the amendment noted that during the debate, a clause of section 3, had been labelled a blank check or loophole for wider military activity. It reads, "...except that this shall not preclude such protective measures as may be necessary to insure the safety of the Multinational Force in Lebanon." They argued that the words in the resolution, "protect" or "protective" are qualitatively broader than the words "defend" or "defensive," so the first part of the amendment substitutes "defend," which means "to take action against attack of challenge" and "defensive" meaning "devoted to resisting or preventing aggression or attack," and which both emphasize present danger, for "protect" or "protective" which are more ambiguous, indirect terms. The second part of the amendment simply requires the President to report on facets of the Lebanon situation cited in sections 2(a)(1) and 2(a)(2) of the findings and purpose section of the resolution.

No statements were made in opposition to the amendment.

S.J. Res. 159: Vote Nos. 269-274.

RESULT: MOTION TO TABLE AGREED TO

YEAS (66)			NAYS (34)			NOT VOTING (0)
Democrats (11 or 24%)	**Republicans (55 or 100%)**		**Democrats (34 or 76%)**		**Republicans (0 or 0%)**	
Boren	Abdnor	Kassebaum	Baucus	Lautenberg		
Chiles	Andrews	Kasten	Bentsen	Levin		
Dixon	Armstrong	Laxalt	Biden	Long		
Exon	Baker	Lugar	Bingaman	Matsunaga		
Ford	Boschwitz	Mathias	Bradley	Melcher		
Glenn	Chafee	Mattingly	Bumpers	Metzenbaum		
Heflin	Cochran	McClure	Burdick	Moynihan		
Johnston	Cohen	Murkowski	Byrd	Pell		
Leahy	D'Amato	Nickles	Cranston	Proxmire		
Mitchell	Danforth	Packwood	DeConcini	Pryor		
Nunn	Denton	Percy	Dodd	Randolph		
	Dole	Pressler	Eagleton	Riegle		
	Domenici	Quayle	Hart	Sarbanes		
	Durenberger	Roth	Hollings	Sasser		
	East	Rudman	Huddleston	Stennis		
	Evans	Simpson	Inouye	Tsongas		
	Garn	Specter	Kennedy	Zorinsky		
	Goldwater	Stafford				
	Gorton	Stevens				
	Grassley	Symms				
	Hatch	Thurmond				
	Hatfield	Tower				
	Hawkins	Trible				
	Hecht	Wallop				
	Heinz	Warner				
	Helms	Weicker				
	Humphrey	Wilson				
	Jepsen					

ANALYSIS OF ISSUE VOTED ON:

Party Cohesion	**Measure of Party Support on Issue as Voted on**	
	For (66)	*Against* (34)
Democrats— 76%	Democrats— 11 or 17%	Democrats— 34 or 100%
Republicans— 100%	Republicans— 55 or 83%	Republicans— 0 or 0%

Prepared and Compiled by Senate Democratic Policy Committee
Robert C. Byrd, Chairman

SENATE VOTING RECORD

NO. 274

98th Congress
1st Session

September 29, 1983, 2:23 p.m.
Temp. Cong. Rec. p. S-13167

LEBANON MULTINATIONAL FORCE/WAR POWERS

BILL NO.: S.J. Res. 159

TITLE: "Multinational Force in Lebanon Resolution."

SUBJECT: **Passage of the joint resolution providing statutory authorization under the War Powers Resolution for continued U.S. participation in the Multinational Peacekeeping Force in Lebanon for an additional 18 months in order to obtain withdrawal of all foreign forces from Lebanon and requiring the President to report thereon to Congress every three months.**

NOTE: S.J. Res. 159 became Public Law 98-119, approved October 12, 1983.

S.J. Res. 159: Vote Nos. 269-274.

RESULT: JOINT RESOLUTION PASSED

YEAS (54)

Democrats (2 or 4%)

Mitchell
Zorinsky

Republicans (52 or 95%)

Abdnor
Andrews
Armstrong
Baker
Boschwitz
Chafee
Cochran
Cohen
D'Amato
Danforth
Denton
Dole
Domenici
Durenberger
East
Evans
Garn
Goldwater
Gorton
Grassley
Hatch
Hawkins
Hecht
Heinz
Helms
Humphrey
Jepsen
Kassebaum
Kasten
Laxalt
Lugar
Mathias
Mattingly
McClure
Murkowski
Nickles
Packwood
Percy
Pressler
Quayle
Rudman
Simpson
Specter
Stafford
Stevens
Symms
Thurmond
Tower
Trible
Wallop
Warner
Wilson

NAYS (46)

Democrats (43 or 96%)

Baucus
Bentsen
Biden
Bingaman
Boren
Bradley
Bumpers
Burdick
Byrd
Chiles
Cranston
DeConcini
Dixon
Dodd
Eagleton
Exon
Ford
Glenn
Hart
Heflin
Hollings
Huddleston
Inouye
Johnston
Kennedy
Lautenberg
Leahy
Levin
Long
Matsunaga
Melcher
Metzenbaum
Moynihan
Nunn
Pell
Proxmire
Pryor
Randolph
Riegle
Sarbanes
Sasser
Stennis
Tsongas

Republicans (3 or 5%)

Hatfield
Roth
Weicker

NOT VOTING (0)

ANALYSIS OF ISSUE VOTED ON:

Party Cohesion

Democrats— 96%
Republicans— 95%

Measure of Party Support on Issue as Voted on

For (54)
Democrats— 2 or 4%
Republicans— 52 or 96%

Against (46)
Democrats— 43 or 93%
Republicans— 3 or 7%

Prepared and Compiled by Senate Democratic Policy Committee
Robert C. Byrd. Chairman

MAJOR PROVISIONS

Provides Congressional authorization for continued U.S. participation in the Multinational Force in Lebanon for an additional 18 months beginning on the date of enactment, unless one of the following events happens earlier: (1) withdrawal of all foreign forces from Lebanon, except if the President determines and certifies to Congress that continued U.S. Armed Forces participation in the MNF in Lebanon is required after such withdrawal in order to accomplish the purposes specified in the September 25, 1982, exchange of letters providing for the establishment of the MNF in Lebanon; (2) assumption by the United Nations or the government of Lebanon of the responsibilities of the MNF in Lebanon; or (3) implementation of other effective security arrangements in the area.

States that the mission of the troops is as described in the exchange of letters between Lebanon and the U.S. with the exception "that this shall not preclude such protective measures as may be necessary to ensure the safety of the Multinational Force in Lebanon."

Provides that Congress may direct earlier termination by joint resolution (requiring a two-thirds vote to override a probable veto.)

States that Congress can extend the authorization at the end of the 18 months but makes no provision in the event Congress does not extend the authorization.

Affirms that the Lebanon Emergency Assistance Act (P.L. 98-43) which provides that "The President shall obtain statutory authorization from the Congress with respect to any substantial expansion in the number or role of United States Armed Forces...." holds under this resolution.

Requires the President to report at least every 3 months on the situation in Lebanon.

Contains a Congressional finding that: "United States Armed Forces participating in the Multinational Force in Lebanon are now in hostilities requiring authorization of their continued presence under the War Powers Resolution."

Contains a Congressional determination that: "the requirements of section 4(a)(1) of the War Powers Resolution became operative on August 29, 1983".

Contains a Congressional intention that: "this joint resolution [is] to constitute the necessary specific statutory authorization under the War Powers Resolution for continued participation by United States Armed Forces in the Multinational Force in Lebanon."

Also states that the authorization is "for purposes of section 5(b) of the War Powers Resolution".

SENATE VOTING RECORD

NO. 275

98th Congress
1st Session

September 29, 1983, 5:39 p.m.
Temp. Cong. Rec. p. S-13205

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION (FSC)

BILL NO.: S. 1887 (H.R. 3929) **AMENDMENT NO.:** 2247

TITLE: "Federal Supplemental Compensation Amendments of 1983."

SUBJECT: **Moynihan-Byrd, et al, substitute amendment providing for computation of the duration of FSC benefits on either the insured unemployment rate (IUR) or the total unemployment rate (TUR), whichever results in a longer benefit duration rather than using only the IUR, as reported and as in present law; extending benefits for 7, 9, 12, or 14 weeks rather than 6, 8, 10, or 12 weeks; adding four weeks of benefits for persons whose benefits have expired since April 1, 1983; extending the program for nine months instead of 18 months; mandating the Secretary of Labor to conduct a study and report to Congress on alternatives to the present unemployment insurance (UI) system; and stating the sense of Congress that the Finance and Ways and Means Committees should expeditiously undertake studies and conduct hearings concerning a general reform of the UI system.**

NOTE: Proponents declared that the amendment represented a reasonable interim package which provides more adequate benefits to the long-term unemployed at a modest cost of approximately $580 million more than the Committee bill. It would also give Congress an additional incentive to reform the UI system next June and assure that adequate information on the program and possible alternatives will be available. The IUR has proven unreliable and inadequate as a measure of a State's economic distress and unemployment benefit needs. Although the use of the TUR may not be a perfect solution, they commented, it would provide a reasonable and realistic alternative method for States to qualify for FSC benefits and hopefully prevent further instances of States with the highest IUR rates only being eligible for the minimum period of FSC benefits. The unemployment insurance program contributes to the nation's economic stability. This amendment will correct serious deficiencies and flaws in the system until Congress can undertake more comprehensive reform.

(OVER)

S. 1887 (H.R. 3929): Vote Nos. 275-278.

RESULT: AMENDMENT REJECTED

YEAS (34)

Democrats (31 or 76%)

Baucus
Bentsen
Biden
Bingaman
Boren
Bradley
Burdick
Byrd
DeConcini
Dixon
Dodd
Eagleton
Ford
Glenn
Heflin
Hollings
Huddleston
Inouye
Kennedy
Lautenberg
Leahy
Levin
Matsunaga
Melcher
Metzenbaum
Moynihan
Pell
Randolph
Riegle
Sasser
Tsongas

Republicans (3 or 6%)

Heinz
Mathias
Specter

NAYS (59)

Democrats (10 or 24%)

Bumpers
Chiles
Exon
Johnston
Long
Mitchell
Proxmire
Pryor
Stennis
Zorinsky

Republicans (49 or 94%)

Abdnor
Andrews
Armstrong
Baker
Boschwitz
Chafee
Cochran
Cohen
D'Amato
Danforth
Denton
Dole
Domenici
Durenberger
East
Evans
Garn
Goldwater
Gorton
Grassley
Hatch
Hatfield
Hawkins
Hecht
Helms
Humphrey
Jepsen
Kassebaum
Kasten
Laxalt
Lugar
Mattingly
McClure
Murkowski
Nickles
Packwood
Percy
Pressler
Quayle
Roth
Rudman
Simpson
Stevens
Symms
Thurmond
Trible
Wallop
Warner
Wilson

NOT VOTING (7)

Democrats (4)

Cranston—2
Hart—2
Nunn—2
Sarbanes—2

Republicans (3)

Stafford—2
Tower—2
Weicker—2

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

1—Official Business
2—Necessarily Absent
3—Illness
4—Other

SYMBOLS:

AY—Announced Yea
AN—Announced Nay
PY—Paired Yea
PN—Paired Nay

ANALYSIS OF ISSUE VOTED ON:

Party Cohesion	**Measure of Party Support on Issue as Voted on**	
	For (34)	*Against* (59)
Democrats— 76%	Democrats— 31 or 91%	Democrats— 10 or 17%
Republicans— 94%	Republicans— 3 or 9%	Republicans— 49 or 83%

Prepared and Compiled by Senate Democratic Policy Committee
Robert C. Byrd, Chairman

Opponents stated that the FSC bill was a well-designed 18-month extension package, costing an acceptable $3.6 billion, and should be passed as soon as possible. Increased spending for the unemployment programs will only delay passage of this important legislation and risk a Presidential veto. Furthermore, States are already confused by the multi-tier design and the various revisions of the FSC program. The amendment's optional TUR trigger and additional benefits would only cause additional administrative problems. If a major modification or additional benefits are adopted at this late date, they warned, the payment of benefits could be delayed, causing further hardships for the unemployed.

SENATE VOTING RECORD

NO. 276

98th Congress
1st Session

September 30, 1983, 11:47 a.m.
Temp. Cong. Rec. p. S-13302

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION (FSC)

BILL NO.: S. 1887 (H.R. 3929) **AMENDMENT NO.:** 2253

TITLE: "Federal Supplemental Compensation Amendments of 1983."

SUBJECT: **Byrd, et al, amendment allowing unemployed persons who have exhausted all available unemployment benefits, including Federal Supplemental Compensation (FSC), between April 1, and October 1, 1983, to receive up to three-fourths of the number of weeks of benefits which new FSC beneficiaries would receive in that State (between 4 1/2 and 8 weeks depending on the State's unemployment rate)—the same "reachback" provision contained in the House-passed bill.**

NOTE: Proponents declared that the amendment would provide minimal aid to the nation's citizens unemployed for over one year—a record high number of persons. Congress has a responsibility to deal with the devastating problems of the unemployed and to provide benefits for the basic necessities. The amendment's modest cost of $285 million, after adjustment for expected savings from welfare and food stamp programs, is nominal and would have little effect on the deficit. The importance of assisting the long-term unemployed, they added, more than justifies the expenditure.

Opponents asserted that the Committee bill would provide a solid package of basic unemployment benefits which are tiered to States' IUR rates, and it would be best to pass this important legislation as soon as possible and not risk a Presidential veto. Unemployment rates are falling, they pointed out, making "reachback" provisions no longer necessary. Despite the amendment's "good intentions," the Senate must continue to restrain spending in order to reduce the Federal deficit, and any increase in this Federally-funded program should be defeated.

S. 1887 (H.R. 3929): Vote Nos. 275-278.

RESULT: AMENDMENT REJECTED

YEAS (37)			NAYS (54)			NOT VOTING (9)	
Democrats (33 or 87%)		**Republicans (4 or 8%)**	**Democrats (5 or 13%)**	**Republicans (49 or 92%)**		**Democrats (7)**	**Republicans (2)**
Baucus	Kennedy	Cohen	Exon	Abdnor	Kassebaum	Cranston—2	Humphrey—2
Bentsen	Lautenberg	Heinz	Long	Andrews	Kasten	DeConcini—2	Nickles—2
Biden	Leahy	Mathias	Nunn	Armstrong	Laxalt	Dodd—2	
Bingaman	Levin	Specter	Proxmire	Baker	Lugar	Glenn—2	
Boren	Matsunaga		Zorinsky	Boschwitz	Mattingly	Hollings—2	
Bradley	Melcher			Chafee	McClure	Johnston—2	
Bumpers	Metzenbaum			Cochran	Murkowski	Tsongas—2	
Burdick	Mitchell			D'Amato	Packwood		
Byrd	Moynihan			Danforth	Percy		
Chiles	Pell			Denton	Pressler		
Dixon	Pryor			Dole	Quayle		
Eagleton	Randolph			Domenici	Roth		
Ford	Riegle			Durenberger	Rudman		
Hart	Sarbanes			East	Simpson		
Heflin	Sasser			Evans	Stafford		
Huddleston	Stennis			Garn	Stevens		
Inouye				Goldwater	Symms		
				Gorton	Thurmond		
				Grassley	Tower		
				Hatch	Trible		
				Hatfield	Wallop		
				Hawkins	Warner		
				Hecht	Weicker		
				Helms	Wilson		
				Jepsen			

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:
1—Official Business
2—Necessarily Absent
3—Illness
4—Other

SYMBOLS:
AY—Announced Yea
AN—Announced Nay
PY—Paired Yea
PN—Paired Nay

ANALYSIS OF ISSUE VOTED ON:

Party Cohesion	**Measure of Party Support on Issue as Voted on**	
	For (37)	*Against* (54)
Democrats— 87%	Democrats— 33 or 89%	Democrats— 5 or 9%
Republicans— 92%	Republicans— 4 or 11%	Republicans— 49 or 91%

Prepared and Compiled by Senate Democratic Policy Committee
Robert C. Byrd, Chairman

SENATE VOTING RECORD

NO. 279

98th Congress
1st Session

October 4, 1983, 2:08 p.m.
Temp. Cong. Rec. p. S-13517

LABOR-HHS-EDUCATION APPROPRIATIONS, 1984

BILL NO.: H.R. 3913

AMENDMENT NO.: 2279

TITLE: "Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1984."

SUBJECT: **Weicker motion to table the Huddleston, et al, amendment appropriating $50 million for 20-year interest-free loans to aid schools with removing asbestos from their facilities, as authorized in section 6 of the Asbestos School Hazard Detection and Control Act of 1980.**

NOTE: Proponents of the amendment declared that the Federal government must honor its commitment to aid U.S. school districts in handling the asbestos health hazard. The 1980 Act mandated the inspection of schools for asbestos hazards and authorized grants and loans to aid in its removal or containment, but funding has never been appropriated. Schools are now having to divert education funds to this purpose. The quality and effectiveness of America's education system, which several recent reports have criticized, can only suffer more. The Senate cannot afford to await the release of a Department of Education study on this critical problem before acting. Data already released from the report indicate that 14,000 schools have asbestos-related hazards which seriously threaten the health of their children and teachers. The Department's study also estimates that it will cost $100,000 per school to correct the problem, and this amendment would provide a modest beginning for the Federally-mandated loan program which would assist financially-strapped school districts in ridding their facilities of this dangerous health hazard. The House has appropriated $50 million for the program, and the Senate should do likewise so that this authorized program can begin to make our schools safe from asbestos.

(OVER)

H.R. 3913: Vote Nos. 279-282.

RESULT: MOTION TO TABLE AGREED TO

YEAS (58)

Democrats (8 or 20%)

DeConcini
Dixon
Dodd
Eagleton
Exon
Nunn
Proxmire
Zorinsky

Republicans (50 or 94%)

Abdnor
Andrews
Baker
Boschwitz
Chafee
Cochran
D'Amato
Danforth
Denton
Dole
Domenici
Durenberger
East
Evans
Garn
Goldwater
Gorton
Grassley
Hatch
Hatfield
Hawkins
Hecht
Heinz
Helms
Humphrey
Jepsen
Kassebaum
Kasten
Laxalt
Lugar
Mattingly
McClure
Murkowski
Nickles
Packwood
Percy
Pressler
Quayle
Roth
Rudman
Simpson
Stevens
Symms
Thurmond
Tower
Trible
Wallop
Warner
Weicker
Wilson

NAYS (35)

Democrats (32 or 80%)

Bentsen
Biden
Bingaman
Boren
Bradley
Bumpers
Burdick
Byrd
Chiles
Ford
Hart
Heflin
Hollings
Huddleston
Johnston
Kennedy
Lautenberg
Leahy
Levin
Long
Matsunaga
Melcher
Metzenbaum
Mitchell
Moynihan
Pell
Pryor
Randolph
Sarbanes
Sasser
Stennis
Tsongas

Republicans (3 or 6%)

Cohen
Specter
Stafford

NOT VOTING (7)

Democrats (5)

Baucus—2
Cranston—2
Glenn—2
Inouye—2
Riegle—4AN

Republicans (2)

Armstrong—2
Mathias—2

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

1—Official Business
2—Necessarily Absent
3—Illness
4—Other

SYMBOLS:

AY—Announced Yea
AN—Announced Nay
PY—Paired Yea
PN—Paired Nay

ANALYSIS OF ISSUE VOTED ON:

Party Cohesion

Democrats— 80%
Republicans— 94%

Measure of Party Support on Issue as Voted on

For (58)
Democrats— 8 or 14%
Republicans— 50 or 86%

Against (35)
Democrats— 32 or 91%
Republicans— 3 or 9%

Prepared and Compiled by Senate Democratic Policy Committee
Robert C. Byrd, Chairman

Opponents of the amendment maintained that they were equally concerned about the potential health hazard caused by asbestos in American schools, but that the Senate should await the complete report before acting so that it will have the information necessary to make a responsible decision. An initial $50 million appropriation for this program could easily increase to $100 million, and the cost of carrying the interest-free loans could eventually amount to more than the principal. Adding this program to the bill, which is already $400 million over the House version, will seriously weaken the Senate's negotiating position in conference and risk a Presidential veto. Others advised the Senate to go to conference with the House and take appropriate action on this item after the release of the Education Department's report.

SENATE VOTING RECORD

NO. 280

98th Congress
1st Session

October 4, 1983, 3:36 p.m.
Temp. Cong. Rec. p. S-13529

LABOR-HHS-EDUCATION APPROPRIATIONS, 1984

BILL NO.: H.R. 3913 AMENDMENT NO.: 2282

TITLE: "Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1984."

SUBJECT: **Weicker motion to table the appeal of the ruling of the Chair that the Bradley-Hollings, et al, amendment increasing appropriations by $559 million for elementary, secondary, and higher education programs, is out of order because it violates Rule XVI, paragraph 1, by increasing an appropriation not authorized by existing law.** (The amendment would add $350 million for Chapter I compensatory education for the disadvantaged, $102 million for vocational and adult education, $90 million for campus-based student aid, and $17 million for research and graduate assistance.)

NOTE: Proponents of the amendment declared that the Senate should honor its commitment to increase Federal aid to education made in the First Concurrent Budget Resolution (Vote No. 78). The Committee bill proposes funding education programs at the 1981 level, a 22 percent cut in real dollar value, and $2 billion below budget resolution levels. This amendment would provide more adequate funding for high priority needs-based education programs without being a "budget-busting amendment." It increases funding for these vital programs to help reverse the effects of drastic cuts in recent years, but is still well below the levels authorized in the budget resolution. Recent reports indicate that a "rising tide of mediocrity has swept over the national education system," which threatens our political and economic security as well. The Senate's obligation to restore America's quality education system should far outweigh its desire to exercise its legislative prerogatives and offset any fears of a Presidential veto. The objection that this amendment is legislation on an appropriation bill may be warranted, they

(OVER)

H.R. 3913: Vote Nos. 279-282.

RESULT: MOTION TO TABLE AGREED TO

YEAS (50)

Democrats (1 or 2%)

Proxmire

Republicans (49 or 91%)

Abdnor
Andrews
Armstrong
Baker
Boschwitz
Chafee
D'Amato
Danforth
Denton
Dole
Domenici
Durenberger
East
Evans
Garn
Goldwater
Gorton
Grassley
Hatch
Hatfield
Hawkins
Hecht
Heinz
Helms
Humphrey
Jepsen
Kassebaum
Kasten
Laxalt
Lugar
Mattingly
McClure
Murkowski
Nickles
Packwood
Percy
Quayle
Roth
Rudman
Simpson
Stevens
Symms
Thurmond
Tower
Trible
Wallop
Warner
Weicker
Wilson

NAYS (45)

Democrats (40 or 98%)

Baucus
Bentsen
Biden
Bingaman
Boren
Bradley
Bumpers
Burdick
Byrd
Chiles
DeConcini
Dixon
Dodd
Eagleton
Exon
Ford
Hart
Heflin
Hollings
Huddleston
Johnston
Kennedy
Lautenberg
Leahy
Levin
Long
Matsunaga
Melcher
Metzenbaum
Mitchell
Moynihan
Nunn
Pell
Pryor
Randolph
Sarbanes
Sasser
Stennis
Tsongas
Zorinsky

Republicans (5 or 9%)

Cochran
Cohen
Pressler
Specter
Stafford

NOT VOTING (5)

Democrats (4)

Cranston—2
Glenn—2
Inouye—2
Riegle—4AN

Republicans (1)

Mathias—2

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

1—Official Business
2—Necessarily Absent
3—Illness
4—Other

SYMBOLS:

AY—Announced Yea
AN—Announced Nay
PY—Paired Yea
PN—Paired Nay

ANALYSIS OF ISSUE VOTED ON:

Party Cohesion	**Measure of Party Support on Issue as Voted on**	
	For (50)	*Against* (45)
Democrats— 98%	Democrats— 1 or 2%	Democrats— 40 or 89%
Republicans— 91%	Republicans— 49 or 98%	Republicans— 5 or 11%

Prepared and Compiled by Senate Democratic Policy Committee
Robert C. Byrd, Chairman

stated, but it would not have been offered to this bill had the vocational education reauthorization bill been allowed to go to conference. America needs action—not delay. The decision to adopt or reject this amendment should not be made on a monetary basis, but on its ability to restore quality to America's school system. As the President's commission on education stated: "Excellence costs. But in the long run mediocrity costs far more."

Opponents of the amendment pointed out that for the first time in five years, Congress has a chance to pass an appropriations bill giving Congressional authority and direction to education, health, science, and job training programs. Budget resolution levels are limitations—not target figures which must be met. The Committee bill provides important increases in the majority of education programs, including the full amount authorized for Chapter I, and represents a $940 million increase over fiscal 1983 appropriations. Adoption of this amendment would only delay the conference and jeopardize enactment. The Administration has declared that it will not accept additional funding in the bill and, if vetoed, these programs will return to the lower continuing resolution levels.

SENATE VOTING RECORD

NO. 281

98th Congress
1st Session

October 4, 1983, 5:50 p.m.
Temp. Cong. Rec. p. S-13547

LABOR-HHS-EDUCATION APPROPRIATIONS, 1984

BILL NO.: H.R. 3913

AMENDMENT NO.: 2291

TITLE: "Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1984."

SUBJECT: **Baker motion to table the Quayle, et al. amendment increasing appropriations by $319 million for programs for economically disadvantaged youth under the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) in order to restore approximately one-third of the cut from current funding.**

NOTE: *Proponents of the amendment asserted that the JTPA was a necessary and potentially effective system for aiding the unemployed, and Congress should not renege on its commitment to provide the resources for it. Job training and employment programs have suffered $4 billion in funding cuts since 1980, while the unemployment rate has soared and underemployment has affected millions of Americans. JTPA, which received unanimous bipartisan support in the Senate, was designed to bring private enterprise and all levels of government into a cooperative partnership to tackle these enormous problems. The Administration has proclaimed the JTPA to be its centerpiece of renewed effort to assist disadvantaged unemployed persons, and yet the President has recommended a 30 percent cut to the system before it even can get started. This amendment would insure more adequate funding levels for JTPA activities including the Job Corps—a highly successful and much needed program targeted to unemployed teenagers, dislocated worker programs which address one of the most important problems facing the American workforce, and training for special population sectors such as migrant and seasonal farmworkers. The amendment would not increase funding but merely restore one-third of the Committee's cut to current funding; it would still yield $200 million in savings in FY 1984.*

Opponents of the amendment stated that they supported its intentions, but were compelled to vote to table it in order to uphold the Senate's committee system.

H.R. 3913: Vote Nos. 279-282.

RESULT: MOTION TO TABLE AGREED TO.

YEAS (50)			NAYS (44)			NOT VOTING (6)	
Democrats (6 or 15%)	**Republicans (44 or 81%)**		**Democrats (34 or 85%)**		**Republicans (10 or 19%)**	**Democrats (5)**	**Republicans (1)**
Boren	Abdnor	Kassebaum	Baucus	Huddleston	Boschwitz	Biden—^{2AN}	Mathias—^{2}
DeConcini	Andrews	Kasten	Bentsen	Johnston	Cochran	Cranston—^{2}	
Long	Armstrong	Laxalt	Bingaman	Kennedy	Cohen	Inouye—^{2}	
Nunn	Baker	Mattingly	Bradley	Lautenberg	Hatch	Leahy—^{2AN}	
Proxmire	Chafee	McClure	Bumpers	Levin	Hawkins	Mitchell—^{2AN}	
Stennis	D'Amato	Murkowski	Burdick	Matsunaga	Heinz		
	Danforth	Nickles	Byrd	Melcher	Lugar		
	Denton	Percy	Chiles	Metzenbaum	Packwood		
	Dole	Pressler	Dixon	Moynihan	Quayle		
	Domenici	Roth	Dodd	Pell	Stafford		
	Durenberger	Rudman	Eagleton	Pryor			
	East	Simpson	Exon	Randolph			
	Evans	Specter	Ford	Riegle			
	Garn	Stevens	Glenn	Sarbanes			
	Goldwater	Symms	Hart	Sasser			
	Gorton	Thurmond	Heflin	Tsongas			
	Grassley	Tower	Hollings	Zorinsky			
	Hatfield	Trible					
	Hecht	Wallop					
	Helms	Warner					
	Humphrey	Weicker					
	Jepsen	Wilson					

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

1—Official Business
2—Necessarily Absent
3—Illness
4—Other

SYMBOLS:

AY—Announced Yea
AN—Announced Nay
PY—Paired Yea
PN—Paired Nay

ANALYSIS OF ISSUE VOTED ON:

Party Cohesion	**Measure of Party Support on Issue as Voted on**	
	For (50)	*Against* (44)
Democrats— 85%	Democrats— 6 or 12%	Democrats— 34 or 77%
Republicans— 81%	Republicans— 44 or 88%	Republicans— 10 or 23%

Prepared and Compiled by Senate Democratic Policy Committee
Robert C. Byrd. Chairman

SENATE VOTING RECORD

NO. 313

98th Congress
1st Session

October 25, 1983, 11:10 a.m.
Temp. Cong. Rec. p. S-14589

SURFACE TRANSPORTATION ACT

BILL NO.: H.R. 3103 **AMENDMENT NO.:** 2431

TITLE: "Surface Transportation Technical Corrections Act of 1983."

SUBJECT: **Chafee motion to table the Metzenbaum-Specter amendment deleting the section of the bill which modifies the "Buy American" provisions to prohibit use of Federal highway funds for projects costing more than $500,000 unless substantially all materials used in the project are of American origin and allows the Secretary of Transportation to waive this prohibition (1) when it would be inconsistent with the public interest, and (2) where inclusion of domestic material will increase the cost of the project by more than 25 percent, or by 10 percent in the case of rolling stock.** (See also Vote No. 412, 97th-2d.)

NOTE: Proponents of the amendment noted this language would restore the weaker provision first enacted in 1978 and reverse the progress made since the Surface Transportation Assistance Act of 1982 (STAA) became law. More than 100,000 American jobs have been created since last year. While the differential increase from 10 to 25 percent is an improvement, the exemption for all projects under $500,000 in cost is a setback, considering that 60 percent of all highway projects are in this category. Another problem occurs with the requirement that "substantially all" of the material must be of American origin because it is interpreted to mean 51 percent of the cost of the total project. These changes could replace 550,000 tons of domestic steel with foreign steel, which translates into the loss of more than 3,700 steel jobs. American manufacturers must be protected from unfair foreign competition.

(OVER)

H.R. 3103: Vote Nos. 313, 315.

RESULT: MOTION TO TABLE AGREED TO

YEAS (55)

Democrats (12 or 30%)

Baucus
Bradley
Bumpers
Burdick
Hart
Lautenberg
Leahy
Moynihan
Nunn
Pell
Proxmire
Tsongas

Republicans (43 or 86%)

Abdnor
Andrews
Armstrong
Baker
Boschwitz
Chafee
Cochran
Cohen
Danforth
Domenici
East
Evans
Garn
Gorton
Grassley
Hatch
Hatfield
Hecht
Helms
Humphrey
Jepsen
Kassebaum
Laxalt
Lugar
Mathias
Mattingly
McClure
Murkowski
Nickles
Packwood
Percy
Quayle
Roth
Rudman
Simpson
Stafford
Symms
Thurmond
Trible
Wallop
Warner
Weicker
Wilson

NAYS (35)

Democrats (28 or 70%)

Bentsen
Biden
Bingaman
Boren
Byrd
Chiles
Cranston
DeConcini
Dixon
Exon
Ford
Glenn
Heflin
Huddleston
Inouye
Johnston
Kennedy
Levin
Long
Melcher
Metzenbaum
Mitchell
Pryor
Randolph
Sarbanes
Sasser
Stennis
Zorinsky

Republicans (7 or 14%)

Denton
Dole
Durenberger
Heinz
Kasten
Pressler
Specter

NOT VOTING (10)

Democrats (5)

Dodd—2
Eagleton—2
Hollings—2AN
Matsunaga—2
Riegle—4

Republicans (5)

D'Amato—2
Goldwater—2
Hawkins—2AY
Stevens—2
Tower—2AY

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

1—Official Business
2—Necessarily Absent
3—Illness
4—Other

SYMBOLS:

AY—Announced Yea
AN—Announced Nay
PY—Paired Yea
PN—Paired Nay

ANALYSIS OF ISSUE VOTED ON:

Party Cohesion	Measure of Party Support on Issue as Voted on	
	For (55)	*Against* (35)
Democrats— 70%	Democrats— 12 or 22%	Democrats— 28 or 80%
Republicans— 86%	Republicans— 43 or 78%	Republicans— 7 or 20%

Prepared and Compiled by Senate Democratic Policy Committee
Robert C. Byrd, Chairman

Opponents of the amendment pointed out that the price differential increase from 10 to 25 percent was substantial and noted that only 1 percent of the structural-steel used in Federal highway projects was foreign even under the lesser 10 percent provision. While it is true that 60 percent of highway projects cost under $500,000, they represent only 10 percent of the dollars spent on such projects. The Committee, they noted, adopted this provision by voice vote, feeling that the conference agreement as understood by the Senate conferees to last year's Act should become law. The Administration endorses the restoration of this language as indicated in the September 29, 1983, letter from the Special Trade Representative William Brock.

SENATE VOTING RECORD

NO. 317

98th Congress
1st Session

October 26, 1983, 5:56 p.m.
Temp. Cong. Rec. p. S-14663

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1984

BILL NO.: H.R. 3959 **AMENDMENT NO.:** 2443

TITLE: "Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1984."

SUBJECT: **Thurmond motion to table the Biden-DeConcini, et al, amendment establishing a Director of National and International Drug Operations and Policy, appointed by the President subject to Senate confirmation, to coordinate and direct all Federal efforts to stop the flow of illegal drugs; establishing a one-year 16-member Commission on Drug Interdiction and Enforcement to recommend a coordinated national effort; and appropriating $1 million for these efforts.** (Subsequently, the amendment was agreed to by voice vote. See also Vote No. 381, 97th-2d.)

NOTE: Proponents cited estimates that illegal drug trafficking is the root of as much as 70 percent of all violent crime in the U.S., and according to GAO, has grown into an $80-billion-a-year industry. Regional attempts to enforce the law have produced a paltry 5 to 15 percent interdiction rate for hard drugs flowing into the country resulting in a rise in the supply and use of many dangerous drugs. This problem requires a consistent, centrally directed attack from the highest levels of government, starting with a clearcut strategy for combatting drugs in every region of the country. The drug operations Director would report directly to the President and would have sufficient clout to impose a truce on interagency feuding, maximize agency participation, and allocate resources effectively. The concept of strong central oversight has been endorsed by the Senate Drug Enforcement Caucus, GAO, and the Senate Judiciary Committee, as shown by its 12-5 vote to report a bill. The Office need not be large since its duties could be performed by personnel borrowed from existing agencies. Proponents refused to concede that adoption of the amendment necessarily meant the bill would be vetoed, contending that the Administration appears willing to negotiate.

Opponents argued that an appropriation is an improper vehicle for such an amendment, especially since the Judiciary Committee has reported a similar bill, S. 1787, which is on the calendar. Last year, the President's strong objections to a "drug czar" prompted him to pocket veto an important crime package; the issue is still controversial enough to jeopardize this bill.

H.R. 3959: Vote Nos. 316-318, 371-378.

RESULT: MOTION TO TABLE DEFEATED

YEAS (40)			NAYS (53)			NOT VOTING (7)	
Democrats (2 or 5%)	**Republicans (38 or 75%)**		**Democrats (40 or 95%)**		**Republicans (13 or 25%)**	**Democrats (3)**	**Republicans (4)**
Long	Abdnor	Lugar	Baucus	Huddleston	Boschwitz	Hollings—2	Andrews—2
Stennis	Armstrong	Mathias	Bentsen	Inouye	Cohen	Riegle—4	Dole—2
	Baker	McClure	Biden	Johnston	D'Amato	Tsongas—2	Durenberger—2
	Chafee	Murkowski	Bingaman	Kennedy	Domenici		Goldwater—2
	Cochran	Nickles	Boren	Lautenberg	Hatch		
	Danforth	Packwood	Bradley	Leahy	Hawkins		
	Denton	Percy	Bumpers	Levin	Heinz		
	East	Pressler	Burdick	Matsunaga	Humphrey		
	Evans	Quayle	Byrd	Melcher	Mattingly		
	Garn	Rudman	Chiles	Metzenbaum	Roth		
	Gorton	Stevens	Cranston	Mitchell	Simpson		
	Grassley	Symms	DeConcini	Moynihan	Specter		
	Hatfield	Thurmond	Dixon	Nunn	Stafford		
	Hecht	Tower	Dodd	Pell			
	Helms	Trible	Eagleton	Proxmire			
	Jepsen	Wallop	Exon	Pryor			
	Kassebaum	Warner	Ford	Randolph			
	Kasten	Weicker	Glenn	Sarbanes			
	Laxalt	Wilson	Hart	Sasser			
			Heflin	Zorinsky			

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

1—Official Business
2—Necessarily Absent
3—Illness
4—Other

SYMBOLS:

AY—Announced Yea
AN—Announced Nay
PY—Paired Yea
PN—Paired Nay

ANALYSIS OF ISSUE VOTED ON:

Party Cohesion	**Measure of Party Support on Issue as Voted on**	
	For (40)	*Against* (53)
Democrats— 95%	Democrats— 2 or 5%	Democrats— 40 or 75%
Republicans— 75%	Republicans— 38 or 95%	Republicans— 13 or 25%

Prepared and Compiled by Senate Democratic Policy Committee
Robert C. Byrd, Chairman

SENATE VOTING RECORD

NO. 320

98th Congress
1st Session

October 28, 1983, 11:00 a.m.
Temp. Cong. Rec. p. S-14867

PUBLIC DEBT LIMIT

BILL NO.: H.J. Res. 308

AMENDMENT NO.: 2461

SUBJECT: **Chiles amendment forbidding extension of the debt limit ceiling after November 21 unless all Congressional Committees have submitted their legislative proposals required under the reconciliation instructions contained in the FY 1984 Budget Resolution; and providing that the debt limit ceiling may not be extended beyond the earlier of December 21, 1983, or 10 days after *sine die* adjournment if the required reconciliation instructions have not been enacted.**

NOTE: *Proponents asserted that the revised public debt ceiling contained in this joint resolution was derived from the FY 1984 budget resolution in which Congress committed itself to reducing the deficit by $86 billion over the next three years. Congress must honor that commitment now. It cannot afford to wait until 1985 to cut the deficit or the economic recovery will be doomed by skyrocketing interest rates and the tremendous trade imbalance which is being caused by the high cost of the dollar. Contrary to opponent's arguments, the budget resolution is a balanced plan which proposes to reduce the deficit through a combination of revenue increases and spending cuts. If enacted, it would cause outlays as a percent of the GNP to fall to 1.5 percent by 1986 while revenues would rise to 1.4 percent. This amendment would pressure committees to meet their reconciliation instructions as well as place a burden on the President to sign the legislation into law.*

(OVER)

H.J. Res. 308: Vote Nos. 319-330, 369, 370.

RESULT: AMENDMENT REJECTED

YEAS (31)

Democrats (28 or 70%)

Biden
Bingaman
Bumpers
Burdick
Chiles
Dixon
Dodd
Eagleton
Exon
Ford
Hart
Heflin
Huddleston
Inouye
Johnston
Kennedy
Lautenberg
Leahy
Levin
Metzenbaum
Moynihan
Nunn
Pell
Proxmire
Riegle
Sarbanes
Sasser
Tsongas

Republicans (3 or 7%)

Humphrey
Mathias
Weicker

NAYS (53)

Democrats (12 or 30%)

Baucus
Bentsen
Boren
Bradley
Byrd
Long
Matsunaga
Melcher
Mitchell
Pryor
Randolph
Stennis

Republicans (41 or 93%)

Abdnor
Armstrong
Baker
Boschwitz
Chafee
Cohen
D'Amato
Danforth
Dole
Domenici
Durenberger
East
Garn
Gorton
Grassley
Hatch
Hecht
Heinz
Helms
Jepsen
Kassebaum
Kasten
Laxalt
Lugar
Mattingly
McClure
Murkowski
Nickles
Packwood
Percy
Pressler
Roth
Rudman
Specter
Stafford
Stevens
Symms
Thurmond
Trible
Warner
Wilson

NOT VOTING (16)

Democrats (5)

Cranston—^{2}
DeConcini—^{2}
Glenn—^{2}
Hollings—^{2}
Zorinsky—^{2}

Republicans (11)

Andrews—^{2}
Cochran—^{2}
Denton—^{2AN}
Evans—^{2}
Goldwater—^{2}
Hatfield—^{2AY}
Hawkins—^{2}
Quayle—^{2}
Simpson—^{2}
Tower—^{2}
Wallop—^{2}

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

1—Official Business
2—Necessarily Absent
3—Illness
4—Other

SYMBOLS:

AY—Announced Yea
AN—Announced Nay
PY—Paired Yea
PN—Paired Nay

ANALYSIS OF ISSUE VOTED ON:

Party Cohesion	**Measure of Party Support on Issue as Voted on**	
	For (31)	*Against* (53)
Democrats— 70%	Democrats— 28 or 90%	Democrats— 12 or 23%
Republicans— 93%	Republicans— 3 or 10%	Republicans— 41 or 77%

Prepared and Compiled by Senate Democratic Policy Committee
Robert C. Byrd, Chairman

Opponents stated that they appreciated the spirit of the amendment which is intended to pressure the Senate to reduce deficits significantly, but Congress should be working instead on a better and more balanced budget package. A mere $86 billion deficit reduction is not going to solve the problem. Committees should be allowed to work their will and propose responsible spending cuts and revenue raising measures rather than being forced to adhere to an unbalanced package of $73 billion in tax increases and $13 billion in spending cuts as the budget resolution provides. It is doubtful if there is a way to condition a debt limit increase on passage of reconciliation bills and still maintain confidence in the validity of public debt obligations. Furthermore, a Presidential veto of the reconciliation package might also render all extensions of credit invalid. Measuring compliance would also be a problem since Congress could legally make all $73 billion of the required tax increases effective at the end of 1986 and still meet the budget resolution instructions. The nation's debt service program should not be contingent on strictly adhering to the budget resolution. Instead of debating amendments which would be almost impossible to implement, some declared, the Senate should devise a deficit reducing budget package which would be acceptable to Congress and offer it to this bill.

SENATE VOTING RECORD

NO. 326

98th Congress
1st Session

October 31, 1983, 6:12 p.m.
Temp. Cong. Rec. p. S-15018

PUBLIC DEBT LIMIT

BILL NO.: H.J. Res. 308

AMENDMENT NO.: 2475

SUBJECT: **Kasten amendment expressing the sense of the Senate that no further tax increases should be enacted until Congress fulfills its pledge to reduce spending by three dollars for every dollar of revenue raised under the Tax Equity and Fiscal Responsibility Act of 1982.**

NOTE: Proponents asserted that Federal spending trends must be reversed and the emphasis in the battle to reduce the deficit be shifted to spending cuts rather than tax increases. Current deficit reduction plans being considered by the Senate all emphasize "revenue enhancement" while spending is the real cause of deficits and the ever-growing public debt. Tax hikes would only further burden lower and middle-class Americans and could cripple the nation's economic recovery. Furthermore, raising Federal revenues through higher taxes only encourages greater spending. Despite $98 billion in new taxes mandated in TEFRA for FY 1983-85, CBO estimates the deficit will be approximately $190 billion for each of those years. The first and second budget resolutions for FY 1983 both contained plans for a $3 spending cut for every $1 of increased revenue, with the conference report for the first resolution calling for $95 billion in revenue increases and $378.5 billion in spending reductions. The revenue goal has been met but the spending cuts have never been achieved, and the Federal government currently is spending $1.14 for every revenue dollar as the deficit continues to grow. Although the budget resolutions were not binding, they clearly stated Congressional intent and the President concurred. Congress must recognize its commitment to reduce the rate of Federal spending growth and the Federal deficit and face up to its responsibility to maintain the economic recovery and rebuild a solid national economic foundation.

(OVER)

H.J. Res. 308: Vote Nos. 319-330, 369, 370.

RESULT: **AMENDMENT REJECTED**

YEAS (42)

Democrats (5 or 11%)

Boren
Exon
Heflin
Proxmire
Zorinsky

Republicans (37 or 71%)

Abdnor
Andrews
Armstrong
Cochran
D'Amato
Denton
Durenberger
East
Garn
Goldwater
Grassley
Hatch
Hawkins
Hecht
Helms
Humphrey
Jepsen
Kasten
Laxalt
Lugar
Mattingly
McClure
Murkowski
Nickles
Percy
Pressler
Quayle
Roth
Rudman
Simpson
Stevens
Symms
Thurmond
Trible
Wallop
Warner
Wilson

NAYS (55)

Democrats (40 or 89%)

Baucus
Bentsen
Biden
Bingaman
Bradley
Bumpers
Burdick
Byrd
Chiles
Cranston
DeConcini
Dixon
Dodd
Eagleton
Ford
Glenn
Hart
Hollings
Huddleston
Inouye
Johnston
Kennedy
Lautenberg
Leahy
Levin
Long
Matsunaga
Melcher
Metzenbaum
Mitchell
Moynihan
Nunn
Pell
Pryor
Randolph
Riegle
Sarbanes
Sasser
Stennis
Tsongas

Republicans (15 or 29%)

Baker
Chafee
Cohen
Danforth
Dole
Domenici
Evans
Gorton
Hatfield
Heinz
Kassebaum
Packwood
Specter
Stafford
Weicker

NOT VOTING (3)

Democrats (0)

Republicans (3)

Boschwitz—2
Mathias—2
Tower—2

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

1—Official Business
2—Necessarily Absent
3—Illness
4—Other

SYMBOLS:

AY—Announced Yea
AN—Announced Nay
PY—Paired Yea
PN—Paired Nay

ANALYSIS OF ISSUE VOTED ON:

Party Cohesion

Democrats— 89%
Republicans— 71%

Measure of Party Support on Issue as Voted on

For (42)
Democrats— 5 or 12%
Republicans— 37 or 88%

Against (55)
Democrats— 40 or 73%
Republicans— 15 or 27%

Prepared and Compiled by Senate Democratic Policy Committee
Robert C. Byrd, Chairman

Opponents declared that this resolution falsely accuses Congress of betraying the President and declares that it must adhere to an arbitrary 3:1 spending cut/tax increase ratio which it never adopted. A deficit-reducing budget package consisting of this ratio was discussed by the "gang of 17" (a panel of Congressional and Administration representatives appointed to negotiate a budget compromise last year), they pointed out, but never materialized. Ultimately, the conference report for the 1983 reconciliation bill called for $27 billion in spending cuts and $98 billion in revenue increases, a reverse ratio of the one called for in this resolution. Some opponents stated that although they had no objection to the resolution's 3:1 ratio, it would be almost impossible to achieve. If tax increases are made contingent on spending cuts, they added, neither is going to be achieved. Others expressed concern over the precise wording of the resolution which would bind Congress to an uncertain budgetary ratio which even its proponents admit may not be the best one. The only way to reduce the deficit on a long-term basis, they asserted, is to produce a balanced fiscal package primarily consisting of spending cuts as well as revenue changes, such as closing tax loopholes. Congress should work more aggressively to accomplish this, rather than adopt a resolution concerning a Congressional pledge which never existed.

SENATE VOTING RECORD

NO. 327

98th Congress
1st Session

October 31, 1983, 8:30 p.m.
Temp. Cong. Rec. p. S-15058

PUBLIC DEBT LIMIT

BILL NO.: H.J. Res. 308

AMENDMENT NO.: 2476

SUBJECT: Dole motion to table the Kennedy-Hatfield, et al, amendment and, thereby, its perfecting amendment No. 2477 stating as an immediate arms control objective that the U.S. and the Soviet Union should (1) pursue an immediate and complete halt to the nuclear arms race; (2) decide when and how to achieve a mutual verifiable freeze on the testing, production, and further deployment of nuclear warheads, missiles, and other delivery systems; and (3) give special attention to destabilizing weapons whose deployment would make such a freeze more difficult to achieve; and proceeding from the freeze, the U.S. and USSR should pursue major, mutual, and verifiable reductions in nuclear warheads, missiles, and other delivery systems through annual percentages or equally effective means, in a manner that enhances stability. (See also Vote No. 328.)

NOTE: Proponents of the amendment declared that a bilateral, verifiable nuclear arms freeze is negotiable and would be the best way to end the futile, self-perpetuating race to achieve nuclear superiority. The U.S. and the Soviet Union have reached qualitative nuclear parity and a bilateral freeze would prevent the deployment of a new generation of destabilizing weapons. The contention that the U.S. would be frozen into strategic inferiority and vulnerability is unfounded. Soviet missiles have a heavier payload, they admitted, but are less accurate and reliable, fewer in number, and more vulnerable, since 70 percent are land-based. Even if a Soviet strike destroyed all U.S. land-based missiles, over 75 percent of American nuclear arms would remain intact—enough nuclear power to destroy the Soviet Union seven times. The U.S. also currently has superior military aircraft and submarine forces. Unless a freeze is instituted, however, the Soviet Union will proceed with its military modernization plans. This continuous escalation of nuclear forces only proves more destabilizing and increases the risk of an accidental or intentional launch. A freeze would insure strategic stability by only allowing the maintenance and one-to-one replacement of existing weapons, while other proposals, such as builddown, would institutionalize a qualitative competition to build more deadly, more accurate nuclear missiles

(OVER)

H.J. Res. 308: Vote Nos. 319-330, 369, 370.

RESULT: MOTION TO TABLE AGREED TO

ADMINISTRATION POSITION: YEA

YEAS (58)

Democrats (12 or 27%)

Bentsen
Boren
Chiles
DeConcini
Exon
Ford
Heflin
Johnston
Long
Nunn
Stennis
Zorinsky

Republicans (46 or 87%)

Abdnor
Armstrong
Baker
Cochran
Cohen
D'Amato
Danforth
Denton
Dole
Domenici
Durenberger
East
Evans
Garn
Goldwater
Gorton
Grassley
Hatch
Hawkins
Hecht
Heinz
Helms
Humphrey
Jepsen
Kassebaum
Kasten
Lugar
Mattingly
McClure
Murkowski
Nickles
Packwood
Percy
Pressler
Quayle
Roth
Rudman
Simpson
Stevens
Symms
Thurmond
Tower
Trible
Wallop
Warner
Wilson

NAYS (40)

Democrats (33 or 73%)

Baucus
Biden
Bingaman
Bradley
Bumpers
Burdick
Byrd
Cranston
Dixon
Dodd
Eagleton
Glenn
Hart
Hollings
Huddleston
Inouye
Kennedy
Lautenberg
Leahy
Levin
Matsunaga
Melcher
Metzenbaum
Mitchell
Moynihan
Pell
Proxmire
Pryor
Randolph
Riegle
Sarbanes
Sasser
Tsongas

Republicans (7 or 13%)

Andrews
Chafee
Hatfield
Mathias
Specter
Stafford
Weicker

NOT VOTING (2)

Democrats (0)

Republicans (2)

Boschwitz—2
Laxalt—2

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

1—Official Business
2—Necessarily Absent
3—Illness
4—Other

SYMBOLS:

AY—Announced Yea
AN—Announced Nay
PY—Paired Yea
PN—Paired Nay

ANALYSIS OF ISSUE VOTED ON:

Party Cohesion

Democrats— 73%
Republicans— 87%

Measure of Party Support on Issue as Voted on

For (58)
Democrats— 12 or 21%
Republicans— 46 or 79%

Against (40)
Democrats— 33 or 83%
Republicans— 7 or 17%

Prepared and Compiled by Senate Democratic Policy Committee
Robert C. Byrd, Chairman

that are potentially less and less verifiable. Impartial experts have testified several times that a freeze is at least as verifiable as other arms control agreements, including the Administration's START proposal. This proposal provides that any item that cannot be verified will not be frozen. A nuclear arms freeze would also save $100 billion over five years which could be used to strengthen our conventional defense forces. The U.S. and the USSR need to lead the way in renouncing "voodoo" arms control methods which mistakenly theorize that more nuclear weapons today will mean fewer weapons tomorrow. This amendment proposes a reasonable and specific nuclear arms freeze which would insure the strategic stability of both nations and enhance the possibility for negotiated arms reductions.

Opponents of the amendment asserted that a nuclear arms freeze would lock the U.S. into strategic inferiority and inequality, be massively complicated to negotiate and almost impossible to verify, undermine the U.S. negotiating principle that arms control agreements must be equal, balanced, and stabilizing, and remove any Soviet incentive to negotiate control agreements and reduce arms. The USSR would be rewarded for its massive buildup which has led to an unacceptable ratio of 600 Soviet intermediate range missiles to 0 for the U.S., while we would be prevented from deploying major strategic and theatre nuclear weapon systems, including the Pershing II and ground-launched cruise missiles in Europe, which are essential to restoring a nuclear balance and deterring conventional and nuclear attack. The freeze would also prevent replacement of America's aging strategic weapons systems with more effective, survivable, and reliable ones, as well as prevent safety and security improvements to the outmoded systems. Approximately 77 percent of U.S. warheads are on launchers which are 15 or more years old. The USSR has 70 percent of its warheads on launchers less than five years old, and these modern, powerful, and survivable Soviet nuclear forces would be effective for years while a large portion of U.S. forces would become ineffective and obsolete. The freeze would block NATO and Intermediate Nuclear Forces modernization as well, while permitting the USSR to maintain its intermediate range missiles, thereby posing a threat to Europe and undermining American leadership and NATO unity. The USSR has violated or ignored seven nuclear freeze agreements with the U.S., including pacts on the deployment of launchers for ICBM's, SLBM's, and SS-20's. The Senate would be foolish to believe that the USSR will begin to observe freeze agreements now, especially when the freeze would not be verifiable by current technical means and the Soviet Union has historically rejected onsite inspection. Other opponents endorsed the builddown proposal and declared that both nations need to reduce their nuclear weapons stockpiles.

SENATE VOTING RECORD

NO. 332

98th Congress
1st Session

November 3, 1983, 5:30 p.m.
Temp. Cong. Rec. p. S-15342

DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS, 1984

BILL NO.: H.R. 4185 **AMENDMENT NO.:** 2488

TITLE: "Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1984."

SUBJECT: **Stevens amendment cutting funds added by the Committee for the production of the M-1 tank by $168.7 million, thereby reducing the annual production level from 840 to 720 tanks, as in the budget.**

NOTE: Proponents noted the M-1 tank's growing jobs-based constituency and argued that Members have been tempted to increase production to 840 tanks per year on the basis of economic and political, not military, considerations. The Armed Services Committee recommended and the Senate authorized only 600 tanks so that the Army could abide by Congressionally mandated budget constraints, and keep M-1 production in tandem with its engines and escort vehicles; the conference committee accepted the House-passed level of 840, however. According to DOD, its objectives can be met at the lower production level; expanding the program would require reductions in other areas of higher priority. It is essential to establish a stable, sustainable production rate for the 7,058 tanks the Army intends to buy at over $2.7 million each; otherwise, outyear budget pressures will necessitate an inefficient and costly contraction which would slow procurement. There is no indication that procuring 840 tanks per year will cut the unit cost, nor that more tanks will actually reach the active forces.

Opponents maintained that the longstanding lack of progress in planning and procuring a modern tank has been disappointing. Now that a suitable replacement has been developed for the 20-year-old M-60's and older M-48's still used by some National Guard units, Congress should step up production to keep Army modernization on schedule. Savings from prior years and receipts from foreign tank sales totaling $116.6 million can be transferred to the M-1 program. With that amount in transfers, only $57 million in new budget authority is needed. U.S. conventional defense capabilities must be strengthened. The USSR produces 2,000 tanks a year, and has four times more tanks than the U.S. The Army needs 840 tanks per year, but its request was reduced before it even reached Congress by budget reviewers with different priorities.

H.R. 4185: Vote Nos. 332-344, 380.

RESULT: AMENDMENT REJECTED

YEAS (45)

Democrats (7 or 17%)

Burdick
Chiles
Eagleton
Melcher
Proxmire
Pryor
Zorinsky

Republicans (38 or 75%)

Abdnor
Andrews
Armstrong
Baker
Boschwitz
Chafee
Cochran
Danforth
Dole
Domenici
Durenberger
Garn
Gorton
Grassley
Hatch
Hatfield
Hawkins
Hecht
Heinz
Jepsen
Kassebaum
Kasten
Laxalt
Lugar
Mattingly
McClure
Murkowski
Nickles
Percy
Pressler
Roth
Rudman
Simpson
Stafford
Stevens
Trible
Wallop
Warner

NAYS (48)

Democrats (35 or 83%)

Baucus
Bentsen
Biden
Bingaman
Boren
Bradley
Bumpers
Byrd
Cranston
DeConcini
Dixon
Dodd
Exon
Ford
Heflin
Huddleston
Inouye
Johnston
Kennedy
Lautenberg
Leahy
Levin
Long
Matsunaga
Metzenbaum
Mitchell
Moynihan
Nunn
Pell
Randolph
Riegle
Sarbanes
Sasser
Stennis
Tsongas

Republicans (13 or 25%)

D'Amato
Denton
East
Goldwater
Helms
Humphrey
Packwood
Quayle
Specter
Symms
Thurmond
Tower
Wilson

NOT VOTING (7)

Democrats (3)

Glenn—^{2}
Hart—^{2}
Hollings—^{2}

Republicans (4)

Cohen—^{2}
Evans—^{2AY}
Mathias—^{2}
Weicker—^{2}

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

1—Official Business
2—Necessarily Absent
3—Illness
4—Other

SYMBOLS:

AY—Announced Yea
AN—Announced Nay
PY—Paired Yea
PN—Paired Nay

ANALYSIS OF ISSUE VOTED ON:

Party Cohesion	**Measure of Party Support on Issue as Voted on**	
	For (45)	*Against* (48)
Democrats— 83%	Democrats— 7 or 16%	Democrats— 35 or 73%
Republicans— 75%	Republicans— 38 or 84%	Republicans— 13 or 27%

Prepared and Compiled by Senate Democratic Policy Committee
Robert C. Byrd, Chairman

SENATE VOTING RECORD

NO. 337

98th Congress
1st Session

November 7, 1983, 2:45 p.m.
Temp. Cong. Rec. p. S-15576

DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS, 1984

BILL NO.: H.R. 4185 **AMENDMENT NO.:** 2505

TITLE: "Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1984."

SUBJECT: **Bumpers, et al, amendment deleting $2,102,200,000 for Air Force missile procurement and prohibiting the spending of any funds for MX missile procurement.**

NOTE: Proponents pointed out that this would be the last opportunity to debate whether the MX should be built. This highly vulnerable, destabilizing, and expensive weapon would lower the threshold for nuclear war at a time when the U.S. and USSR are increasingly in confrontation. The many warheads on the MX is a wasteful use of warheads under the limit proposed by the President in the START negotiations. The MX in its fixed silos is the least survivable of our line of defenses and per warhead costs 60 percent more than the B-1 and Trident. By 1990 the survivability of the MX after nuclear attack will plummet to 1 to 2 percent, making our $17 billion expenditure good for what amounts to one missile and 10 warheads. Proponents asserted that the $400 billion projected for strategic weapons over the next 5 years under the President's plan is an outrageous overemphasis on the nuclear as opposed to our conventional defensive needs.

Opponents argued that the MX is essential to successful arms reduction talks; otherwise the U.S. will have to bargain away one of the other two legs of the defensive triad. The vulnerability of the system in isolation should not be emphasized; as an integral part of our defenses, the MX will enhance our strategic position and demonstrate our resolve to maintain our ability to deter nuclear attack. The Soviet Union respects power, and the success of the ABM agreement, for example, was due to our expressed willingness to move ahead with the ABM.

H.R. 4185: Vote Nos. 332-344, 380.

RESULT: AMENDMENT REJECTED

ADMINISTRATION POSITION: NAY

YEAS (37)

Democrats (31 or 76%)

- Baucus
- Biden
- Bingaman
- Boren
- Bradley
- Bumpers
- Burdick
- Cranston
- Dodd
- Eagleton
- Exon
- Ford
- Glenn
- Hart
- Hollings
- Huddleston
- Kennedy
- Leahy
- Levin
- Matsunaga
- Melcher
- Metzenbaum
- Mitchell
- Moynihan
- Pell
- Proxmire
- Pryor
- Riegle
- Sarbanes
- Sasser
- Tsongas

Republicans (6 or 12%)

- Andrews
- Hatfield
- Humphrey
- Specter
- Stafford
- Weicker

NAYS (56)

Democrats (10 or 24%)

- Bentsen
- Byrd
- Chiles
- Heflin
- Johnston
- Long
- Nunn
- Randolph
- Stennis
- Zorinsky

Republicans (46 or 88%)

- Abdnor
- Armstrong
- Baker
- Boschwitz
- Chafee
- Cochran
- Cohen
- D'Amato
- Danforth
- Denton
- Dole
- Domenici
- East
- Garn
- Goldwater
- Gorton
- Grassley
- Hatch
- Hawkins
- Hecht
- Heinz
- Helms
- Jepsen
- Kassebaum
- Kasten
- Laxalt
- Lugar
- Mathias
- Mattingly
- McClure
- Murkowski
- Nickles
- Percy
- Pressler
- Quayle
- Roth
- Rudman
- Simpson
- Stevens
- Symms
- Thurmond
- Tower
- Trible
- Wallop
- Warner
- Wilson

NOT VOTING (7)

Democrats (4)

- DeConcini—2
- Dixon—2
- Inouye—2
- Lautenberg—2AY

Republicans (3)

- Durenberger—2
- Evans—2
- Packwood—2

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

1—Official Business
2—Necessarily Absent
3—Illness
4—Other

SYMBOLS:

AY—Announced Yea
AN—Announced Nay
PY—Paired Yea
PN—Paired Nay

ANALYSIS OF ISSUE VOTED ON:

Party Cohesion	**Measure of Party Support on Issue as Voted on**	
	For (37)	*Against* (56)
Democrats— 76%	Democrats— 31 or 84%	Democrats— 10 or 18%
Republicans— 88%	Republicans— 6 or 16%	Republicans— 46 or 82%

Prepared and Compiled by Senate Democratic Policy Committee
Robert C. Byrd, Chairman

32-733 O - 84 - 15

SENATE VOTING RECORD

NO. 339

98th Congress
1st Session

November 7, 1983, 5:14 p.m.
Temp. Cong. Rec. p. S-15597

DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS, 1984

BILL NO.: H.R. 4185 **AMENDMENT NO.:** 2492

TITLE: "Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1984."

SUBJECT: **Kassebaum, et al, amendment stating the sense of the Senate that the President should announce the willingness of the U.S. to suspend flight testing of new MIRV'd ICBM's while strategic arms negotiations proceed, if the USSR also is willing to suspend flight testing of such missiles, and that any agreement entered into between the U.S. and the USSR providing for mutual suspension of flight testing of new MIRV'd ICBM's should provide a reliable means of verification.**

NOTE: Proponents maintained that the amendment would offer a stabilizing effect on arms control negotiations since it would halt U.S. testing of the MX as well as Soviet testing of their modified SS-18's and SS-19's and solid fuel SSX-24's. No U.S. halt would occur without a Soviet halt. While the amendment does not bind the President, it is an appropriate step to take in conjunction with the approval of the MX and shows clearly that the U.S. is not rushing to Armageddon. It would halt far more advanced testing on the Russian side than on ours, and verification of flight tests is really very easy. In response to objections raised over the cost of a halt, proponents cited the enormous total cost of the MX.

Opponents contended that the Soviet Union could not be trusted to abide by a halt in flight testing and cited their record of SALT violations. Only when the USSR believes the U.S. is going to have military parity with them, will they be willing to negotiate seriously. Some questioned our ability to verify reliably whether the USSR is abiding by the halt. Failure to proceed with MX deployment will undercut deterrence, weaken the triad, and make an equitable START agreement more difficult to obtain. Some objected to the language because it does not deal with reducing the 800 Soviet MIRV'd ICBM's deployed since 1975—when the U.S. last deployed its minuteman. The estimated $600 million it would cost to halt testing of the MX, opponents argued, would be very wasteful.

H.R. 4185: Vote Nos. 332-344, 380.

RESULT: AMENDMENT REJECTED

YEAS (42)

Democrats (31 or 79%)

- Baucus
- Bentsen
- Biden
- Bingaman
- Boren
- Bradley
- Bumpers
- Burdick
- Chiles
- DeConcini
- Dodd
- Eagleton
- Ford
- Glenn
- Huddleston
- Johnston
- Kennedy
- Leahy
- Levin
- Matsunaga
- Melcher
- Metzenbaum
- Mitchell
- Moynihan
- Pell
- Proxmire
- Pryor
- Riegle
- Sarbanes
- Sasser
- Tsongas

Republicans (11 or 21%)

- Andrews
- Armstrong
- Dole
- Durenberger
- Hatfield
- Kassebaum
- Mathias
- Pressler
- Specter
- Stafford
- Weicker

NAYS (50)

Democrats (8 or 21%)

- Byrd
- Exon
- Heflin
- Long
- Nunn
- Randolph
- Stennis
- Zorinsky

Republicans (42 or 79%)

- Abdnor
- Baker
- Boschwitz
- Chafee
- Cochran
- Cohen
- D'Amato
- Danforth
- Denton
- Domenici
- East
- Garn
- Goldwater
- Gorton
- Grassley
- Hatch
- Hawkins
- Hecht
- Heinz
- Helms
- Humphrey
- Jepsen
- Kasten
- Laxalt
- Lugar
- Mattingly
- McClure
- Murkowski
- Nickles
- Percy
- Quayle
- Roth
- Rudman
- Simpson
- Stevens
- Symms
- Thurmond
- Tower
- Trible
- Wallop
- Warner
- Wilson

NOT VOTING (8)

Democrats (6)

- Cranston—2
- Dixon—2
- Hart—2
- Hollings—2
- Inouye—2
- Lautenberg—2

Republicans (2)

- Evans—2
- Packwood—2

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

1—Official Business
2—Necessarily Absent
3—Illness
4—Other

SYMBOLS:

AY—Announced Yea
AN—Announced Nay
PY—Paired Yea
PN—Paired Nay

ANALYSIS OF ISSUE VOTED ON:

Party Cohesion	**Measure of Party Support on Issue as Voted on**	
	For (42)	*Against* (50)
Democrats— 79%	Democrats— 31 or 74%	Democrats— 8 or 16%
Republicans— 79%	Republicans— 11 or 26%	Republicans— 42 or 84%

Prepared and Compiled by Senate Democratic Policy Committee
Robert C. Byrd, Chairman

SENATE VOTING RECORD

NO. 341

98th Congress
1st Session

November 8, 1983, 2:27 p.m.
Temp. Cong. Rec. p. S-15648

DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS, 1984

BILL NO.: H.R. 4185

AMENDMENT NO.: 2517

TITLE: "Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1984."

SUBJECT: **Hatfield motion to table the Stevens-Tower-Goldwater amendment increasing appropriations by $124.4 million for the construction of production facilities and the production of binary chemical weapons (nerve gas), as modified by a Boschwitz amendment requiring the Secretary of Defense to destroy at least the equivalent of two existing chemical weapons for each new binary munition produced. (See also Vote No. 342.)**

NOTE: Proponents of the amendment pointed out that this funding was recommended by the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee but deleted in full Committee by a narrow margin. The U.S., they contended, must show its determination to maintain a modern and effective deterrent in order to get the Soviets to agree to a ban on these terrible weapons. If we step back from producing them, the Soviets, as in the past, will cease negotiating. Some contended that the aging weapons need to be replaced, and that the binary weapons will be safer to store, transport, or use. This bill is already $14 billion below the President's January request, and there is no need to cut it further, especially when U.S. chemical weapons capabilities compare so unfavorably with the Soviets. The Boschwitz modification requiring a 2 to 1 drawdown improves the committee language which only states the sense of the Senate that they be replaced on a 1 to 1 basis.

(OVER)

H.R. 4185: Vote Nos. 332-344, 380.

RESULT: MOTION TO TABLE DEFEATED

ADMINISTRATION POSITION: NAY

YEAS (46)

Democrats (29 or 67%)

Baucus
Biden
Bingaman
Boren
Bradley
Burdick
Chiles
Cranston
DeConcini
Dodd
Eagleton
Hart
Huddleston
Kennedy
Lautenberg
Leahy
Levin
Matsunaga
Melcher
Metzenbaum
Mitchell
Moynihan
Pell
Proxmire
Pryor
Riegle
Sarbanes
Sasser
Tsongas

Republicans (17 or 33%)

Andrews
Chafee
Danforth
Durenberger
Gorton
Grassley
Hatfield
Heinz
Kassebaum
Mathias
Packwood
Percy
Pressler
Roth
Specter
Stafford
Weicker

NAYS (48)

Democrats (14 or 33%)

Bentsen
Bumpers
Byrd
Dixon
Exon
Ford
Glenn
Heflin
Johnston
Long
Nunn
Randolph
Stennis
Zorinsky

Republicans (34 or 67%)

Abdnor
Armstrong
Baker
Boschwitz
Cohen
D'Amato
Denton
Dole
Domenici
East
Garn
Goldwater
Hatch
Hawkins
Hecht
Helms
Humphrey
Jepsen
Kasten
Laxalt
Lugar
Mattingly
McClure
Nickles
Quayle
Rudman
Simpson
Stevens
Symms
Thurmond
Tower
Trible
Wallop
Warner

NOT VOTING (5)

Democrats (2)

Hollings—2
Inouye—2

Republicans (3)

Cochran—2
Evans—2PY
Murkowski—2

LIVE PAIRS (1)

PRESENT AND GIVING:	RECEIVING:
Wilson (PN)	Evans (PY)

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

1—Official Business
2—Necessarily Absent
3—Illness
4—Other

SYMBOLS:

AY—Announced Yea
AN—Announced Nay
PY—Paired Yea
PN—Paired Nay

ANALYSIS OF ISSUE VOTED ON:

Party Cohesion	Measure of Party Support on Issue as Voted on *For* (46)	*Against* (48)
Democrats— 67%	Democrats— 29 or 63%	Democrats— 14 or 29%
Republicans— 67%	Republicans— 17 or 37%	Republicans— 34 or 71%

Prepared and Compiled by Senate Democratic Policy Committee
Robert C. Byrd, Chairman

Opponents of the amendment asserted that production of chemical weapons of any sort is morally and diplomatically indefensible. To resume production of such weapons, which was stopped in 1969, would further tarnish our international image. The requested $124.4 million for the production and procurement of 155-millimeter binary shells and the Bigeye bomb is premature because: (1) the current usable stockpile provides a sufficient chemical weapons deterrent, according to the Blue Ribbon Chemical Stockpile Status panel, and (2) information regarding binary weapons is insufficient and no policy exists for their use. A number of technical difficulties have not been addressed. The Bigeye bomb has been in the design stage for 19 years. The Administration has yet to present a clear case for the national security urgency of such weapons. This funding is only a down payment on a $4 to $6 billion system. In trying to get the deficit under control, all major cuts have been in nonmilitary accounts. Even if all nonmilitary spending were cut, a $100 billion deficit would remain. This is clearly one military program we can do without. A number of our NATO allies have publicly announced they will not accept chemical weapons or train their soldiers to use them. With regard to destroying two old weapons for each new weapon produced, some questioned whether the old could be neutralized effectively. Others pointed out that this Boschwitz modification would not decrease arms escalation since 61 percent of the arsenal today is nondeliverable-nonrepairable. It would only take out garbage—from the 61 percent nonfunctional weapons—and put in new, golden, fully functional binary weapons, thereby increasing the current stockpile.

SENATE VOTING RECORD

NO. 342

98th Congress
1st Session

November 8. 1983. 2:53 p.m.
Temp. Cong. Rec. p. S-15649

DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS. 1984

BILL NO.: H.R. 4185 **AMENDMENT NO.:** 2517

TITLE: "Department of Defense Appropriations Act. 1984."

SUBJECT: **Stevens-Tower-Goldwater amendment adding $124.4 million for the construction of production facilities and the production of binary chemical weapons (nerve gas), as modified by a Boschwitz amendment requiring the Secretary of Defense to destroy at least the equivalent of two existing chemical weapons for each new binary munition produced. (See also Vote Nos. 184 and 341.)**

NOTE: Proponents pointed out that this funding was recommended by the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee but deleted in full committee by a narrow margin. The U.S., they contended, must show its determination to maintain a modern and effective deterrent in order to get the Soviets to agree to a ban on these terrible weapons. If we step back from producing them, the Soviets, as in the past, will cease negotiating. Some contended that the aging weapons need to be replaced, and that the binary weapons will be safer to store, transport, or use. This bill is already $14 billion below the President's January request, and there is no need to cut it further, especially when U.S. chemical weapons capabilities compare so unfavorably with the Soviet Union's. The Boschwitz modification requiring a

(OVER)

H.R. 4185: Vote Nos. 332-344. 380.

RESULT: AMENDMENT AGREED TO WITH VICE PRESIDENT VOTING YEA TO BREAK TIE

ADMINISTRATION POSITION: YEA

YEAS (46)			NAYS (46)	
Democrats (13 or 31%)	**Republicans (33 or 66%)**		**Democrats (29 or 69%)**	**Republicans (17 or 34%)**
Bentsen	Abdnor	Kasten	Baucus	Andrews
Bumpers	Armstrong	Laxalt	Biden	Chafee
Dixon	Baker	Lugar	Bingaman	Danforth
Exon	Boschwitz	Mattingly	Boren	Durenberger
Ford	Cohen	McClure	Bradley	Gorton
Glenn	D'Amato	Nickles	Burdick	Grassley
Heflin	Denton	Quayle	Chiles	Hatfield
Johnston	Dole	Rudman	Cranston	Heinz
Long	Domenici	Simpson	DeConcini	Kassebaum
Nunn	East	Stevens	Dodd	Mathias
Randolph	Garn	Symms	Eagleton	Packwood
Stennis	Goldwater	Thurmond	Hart	Percy
Zorinsky	Hatch	Tower	Huddleston	Pressler
	Hecht	Trible	Kennedy	Roth
	Helms	Wallop	Lautenberg	Specter
	Humphrey	Warner	Leahy	Stafford
	Jepsen		Levin	Weicker
			Matsunaga	
			Melcher	
			Metzenbaum	
			Mitchell	
			Moynihan	
			Pell	
			Proxmire	
			Pryor	
			Riegle	
			Sarbanes	
			Sasser	
			Tsongas	

NOT VOTING (5)	
Democrats (2)	**Republicans (3)**
Hollings—^{2}	Cochran—^{2PN}
Inouye—^{2PN}	Evans—^{2PN}
	Murkowski—^{2}

LIVE PAIRS (3)

PRESENT AND GIVING:	RECEIVING:
Hawkins (PY)	Cochran (PN)
Wilson (PY)	Evans (PN)
Byrd (PY)	Inouye (PN)

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

1—Official Business
2—Necessarily Absent
3—Illness
4—Other

SYMBOLS:

AY—Announced Yea
AN—Announced Nay
PY—Paired Yea
PN—Paired Nay

ANALYSIS OF ISSUE VOTED ON:

Party Cohesion	Measure of Party Support on Issue as Voted on	
	For (46)	*Against* (46)
Democrats— 69%	Democrats— 13 or 28%	Democrats— 29 or 63%
Republicans— 66%	Republicans— 33 or 72%	Republicans— 17 or 37%

Prepared and Compiled by Senate Democratic Policy Committee
Robert C. Byrd. Chairman

2 to 1 drawdown improves the committee language which only states the sense of the Senate that they be replaced on a 1 to 1 basis.

Opponents asserted that production of chemical weapons of any sort is morally and diplomatically indefensible. To resume production of such weapons which was stopped in 1969, will further tarnish our international image. The requested $124.4 million for the production and procurement of 155-millimeter binary shells and the Bigeye bomb is premature because: (1) the current usable stockpile provides a sufficient chemical weapons deterrent, according to the Blue Ribbon Chemical Stockpile Status panel, and (2) information regarding binary weapons is insufficient and no policy exists for their use. A number of technical difficulties have not been addressed. The Bigeye bomb has been in the design stage for 19 years. The Administration has yet to present a clear case for the national security urgency of such weapons. This funding is only a down payment on a $4 to $6 billion system. In trying to get the deficit under control, all major cuts have been in nonmilitary accounts. Even if all nonmilitary spending were cut, a $100 billion deficit would remain. This is clearly one military program we can do without. A number of our NATO allies have publicly announced they will not accept chemical weapons or train their soldiers to use them. With regard to destroying two old weapons for each weapon produced, some questioned whether the old could be neutralized effectively. Others argued that the Boschwitz modification did not decrease arms escalation since 61 percent of the arsenal today is nondeliverable-nonrepairable. It only takes out garbage—from the 61 percent nonfunctional weapons—and puts in new, golden, fully functional binary weapons, thereby increasing the current stockpile.

SENATE VOTING RECORD

NO. 348

98th Congress
1st Session

November 10, 1983, 4:38 p.m.
Temp. Cong. Rec. p. S-15848

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, 1984

BILL NO.: H.J. Res. 413 **AMENDMENT NO.:** 2540

SUBJECT: **Hatfield amendment striking $1.36 billion added by the House (Wright amendment) for domestic programs: $165 million for education for the disadvantaged, $81.4 million for vocational education, $12 million for adult education, $30 million for community service block grants, $195 million for low-income energy assistance, $143 million for education for the handicapped, $43.9 million for rehabilitation services, $145 million for education for immigrant children, $30 million for higher education, $20 million for community health centers, $1.7 million for the National Technical Institute for the Deaf, $2 million for Gallaudet College, $75.4 million for job training, $10 million for shelter for the homeless, $300 million for child nutrition (WIC), and $105 million for school lunch.**

NOTE: Proponents of the amendment to strike the House figures contended that although these programs may be worthwhile, incorporating the Wright amendment in the bill would guarantee a veto. They emphasized the need for restraint in offering amendments in view of the midnight expiration of current funding. This is a procedural vote, they argued, to test the mood of the Senate for the considerable amount of work on the bill that remains to be done before midnight.

Opponents contended that the amendment, offered by the House majority leader, fulfills a Congressional commitment made during consideration of the budget to fund vitally needed education and social programs. These spending levels were agreed to in June; therefore, the Wright amendment would not add to the deficit. Nor would striking about $1 billion in spending balance the budget; additional revenues are needed. It appears, however, that the President prefers to attack modest spending for those in need rather than to cut wasteful DOD spending, close tax loopholes for the rich, end the sale of tax advantages between corporations, or consider tax increases. Although it is the President's privilege to veto the bill, his threats to do so should not deter Congress from asserting its independence in behalf of fairness.

H.J. Res. 413: Vote Nos. 347-354, 356-358.

RESULT: AMENDMENT AGREED TO ADMINISTRATION POSITION: YEA

YEAS (53)

Democrats
(9 or 23%)

Baucus
Boren
DeConcini
Exon
Ford
Nunn
Proxmire
Stennis
Zorinsky

Republicans
(44 or 90%)

Abdnor
Armstrong
Baker
Boschwitz
Chafee
Cochran
D'Amato
Danforth
Denton
Dole
Durenberger
East
Garn
Gorton
Grassley
Hatch
Hatfield
Hawkins
Hecht
Heinz
Helms
Humphrey
Jepsen
Kassebaum
Kasten
Lugar
Mathias
Mattingly
McClure
Nickles
Packwood
Percy
Pressler
Quayle
Roth
Rudman
Stevens
Symms
Thurmond
Tower
Trible
Wallop
Warner
Wilson

NAYS (36)

Democrats
(31 or 77%)

Bentsen
Biden
Bingaman
Bradley
Bumpers
Burdick
Byrd
Chiles
Cranston
Dixon
Eagleton
Hart
Heflin
Huddleston
Johnston
Kennedy
Lautenberg
Leahy
Levin
Long
Matsunaga
Melcher
Metzenbaum
Mitchell
Moynihan
Pell
Randolph
Riegle
Sarbanes
Sasser
Tsongas

Republicans
(5 or 10%)

Andrews
Cohen
Specter
Stafford
Weicker

NOT VOTING (11)

Democrats (5)

Dodd—2
Glenn—2
Hollings—2
Inouye—2
Pryor—2

Republicans (6)

Domenici—2
Evans—2AY
Goldwater—2
Laxalt—2
Murkowski—2
Simpson—2

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

1—Official Business
2—Necessarily Absent
3—Illness
4—Other

SYMBOLS:

AY—Announced Yea
AN—Announced Nay
PY—Paired Yea
PN—Paired Nay

ANALYSIS OF ISSUE VOTED ON:

Party Cohesion	**Measure of Party Support on Issue as Voted on**	
	For (53)	*Against* (36)
Democrats— 78%	Democrats— 9 or 17%	Democrats— 31 or 86%
Republicans— 90%	Republicans— 44 or 83%	Republicans— 5 or 14%

Prepared and Compiled by Senate Democratic Policy Committee
Robert C. Byrd, Chairman

SENATE VOTING RECORD

NO. 352

98th Congress
1st Session

November 10, 1983, 9:01 p.m.
Temp. Cong. Rec. p. S-15884

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, 1984

BILL NO.: H.J. Res. 413 **AMENDMENT NO.:** 2572

SUBJECT: **Riegle appeal of the ruling of the Chair that the Riegle, et al, amendment (appropriating $500 million for health care benefits for the unemployed to be available only if a program authorizing such benefits is enacted into law) is out of order as legislation on an appropriations bill. The question is: "Shall the ruling of the Chair stand?"**

NOTE: Proponents of the amendment argued that establishment of such a program was crucial for the millions of unemployed workers and their families who lost all health insurance benefits when their employment was terminated. Delaying action on this matter until Congress reconvenes in 1984 would mean many of these persons would be denied access to needed medical care for several more months. Proponents maintained that the circumstances of those whom the funding would help, if authorizing legislation could be enacted, are so pressing that the Senate should overlook its rules in order to assure this help would be available.

Opponents of the amendment pointed out that the President has threatened to veto any legislation establishing this program that does not contain offsetting revenues. They maintained that the necessary authorizing legislation would probably not be enacted before sine die adjournment in a form that would provide revenue increases to offset fully the increased costs of the health benefits. Some questioned not only whether the Senate would accept the offsetting revenue-raising provision that proponents intended to add to the authorization bill (through restricting current application of income averaging for the personal income tax), but whether it would be adequate to cover the full costs of the program. The financial demands on this program would greatly exceed the amount appropriated. The pressure to increase coverage and expand the program would be tremendous and before long this program could evolve into a national health insurance.

H.J. Res. 413: Vote Nos. 347-354, 356-358.

RESULT: DECISION OF CHAIR SUSTAINED

YEAS (47)

Democrats (8 or 21%)	Republicans (39 or 87%)	
Bentsen	Abdnor	Jepsen
Boren	Andrews	Kassebaum
Exon	Armstrong	Kasten
Johnston	Baker	Lugar
Long	Boschwitz	Mattingly
Proxmire	Chafee	Nickles
Stennis	Cochran	Packwood
Zorinsky	D'Amato	Percy
	Danforth	Pressler
	Denton	Roth
	East	Rudman
	Garn	Stafford
	Gorton	Stevens
	Grassley	Symms
	Hatch	Thurmond
	Hatfield	Trible
	Hawkins	Warner
	Hecht	Weicker
	Helms	Wilson
	Humphrey	

NAYS (36)

Democrats (30 or 79%)		Republicans (6 or 13%)
Baucus	Lautenberg	Cohen
Biden	Leahy	Dole
Bingaman	Levin	Heinz
Bradley	Matsunaga	Mathias
Bumpers	Melcher	Quayle
Burdick	Metzenbaum	Specter
Byrd	Mitchell	
Chiles	Moynihan	
DeConcini	Nunn	
Dixon	Pell	
Eagleton	Randolph	
Ford	Riegle	
Heflin	Sarbanes	
Huddleston	Sasser	
Kennedy	Tsongas	

NOT VOTING (17)

Democrats (7)	Republicans (10)
Cranston—2	Domenici—2
Dodd—2	Durenberger—2
Glenn—2	Evans—2
Hart—2	Goldwater—2
Hollings—2	Laxalt—2
Inouye—2	McClure—2
Pryor—2	Murkowski—2
	Simpson—2
	Tower—2
	Wallop—2

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

1—Official Business
2—Necessarily Absent
3—Illness
4—Other

SYMBOLS:

AY—Announced Yea
AN—Announced Nay
PY—Paired Yea
PN—Paired Nay

ANALYSIS OF ISSUE VOTED ON:

Party Cohesion	Measure of Party Support on Issue as Voted on: *For* (47)	*Against* (36)
Democrats—79%	Democrats—8 or 17%	Democrats—30 or 83%
Republicans—87%	Republicans—39 or 83%	Republicans—6 or 17%

Prepared and Compiled by Senate Democratic Policy Committee
Robert C. Byrd, Chairman

SENATE VOTING RECORD

NO. 353

98th Congress
1st Session

November 10, 1983, 10:33 p.m.
Temp. Cong. Rec. p. S-15894

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, 1984

BILL NO.: H.J. Res. 413 **AMENDMENT NO.:** 2578

SUBJECT: **Ford appeal of the ruling of the Chair that the Ford amendment (requiring the President to submit a balanced budget for each fiscal year or include with such budget a detailed statement explaining why total outlays should exceed total receipts for such fiscal year) is out of order as legislation on an appropriations bill. The question is: "Shall the ruling of the Chair stand?"** (See also Vote Nos. 265 and 280, 97th-2d.)

NOTE: Proponents of the amendment contended it would ensure that the President provides the necessary leadership in making the painful and politically unpopular decisions that will yield a balanced budget. A July 1981 CBO economic forecast indicated that, based on economic trends and budget policies in place at that time, the Federal government would accumulate a surplus of $212 billion from 1982-85. In February 1983, based on the Reagan plan, CBO's estimates showed a record-breaking deficit of $706 billion over the same period. Outward signs such as inflation and unemployment may indicate that the economy is improving, but other fundamental economic factors such as skyrocketing deficits, an overvalued dollar, and high interest rates are alarming. The blame lies squarely on the Administration's grossly unbalanced budget policies and its lack of cooperation with Congress in finding solutions. The President has undercut Congress on defense spending, COLA's, and tax increases. He stands in the way of deficit reductions while continuing to blame unjustly the present Congress and previous administrations for deficit spending. By putting a President on record for submitting a balanced budget, the amendment would require guidance instead of rhetoric on deficit reduction.

Opponents of the amendment argued that only Congress has the Constitutional authority to appropriate funds, although the President recommends the budget. If Congress does not modify unbalanced Presidential budget recommendations, it must share the blame for deficits.

H.J. Res. 413: Vote Nos. 347-354, 356-358.

RESULT: DECISION OF CHAIR SUSTAINED

YEAS (42)			NAYS (40)			NOT VOTING (18)	
Democrats (1 or 3%)	**Republicans (41 or 91%)**		**Democrats (36 or 97%)**		**Republicans (4 or 9%)**	**Democrats (8)**	**Republicans (10)**
Stennis	Abdnor	Humphrey	Baucus	Kennedy	Helms	Cranston—2	Domenici—2
	Andrews	Jepsen	Bentsen	Lautenberg	Mathias	Dodd—2	Durenberger—2
	Armstrong	Kassebaum	Biden	Leahy	Nickles	Glenn—2	Evans—2
	Baker	Kasten	Bingaman	Levin	Symms	Hart—2	Goldwater—2
	Boschwitz	Lugar	Boren	Long		Hollings—2	Laxalt—2
	Chafee	Mattingly	Bradley	Matsunaga		Inouye—2	McClure—2
	Cochran	Packwood	Bumpers	Melcher		Moynihan—2	Murkowski—2
	Cohen	Percy	Burdick	Metzenbaum		Pryor—2	Simpson—2
	D'Amato	Pressler	Byrd	Mitchell			Tower—2
	Danforth	Quayle	Chiles	Nunn			Wallop—2
	Denton	Roth	DeConcini	Pell			
	Dole	Rudman	Dixon	Proxmire			
	East	Specter	Eagleton	Randolph			
	Garn	Stafford	Exon	Riegle			
	Gorton	Stevens	Ford	Sarbanes			
	Grassley	Thurmond	Heflin	Sasser			
	Hatch	Trible	Huddleston	Tsongas			
	Hatfield	Warner	Johnston	Zorinsky			
	Hawkins	Weicker					
	Hecht	Wilson					
	Heinz						

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:
1—Official Business
2—Necessarily Absent
3—Illness
4—Other

ANALYSIS OF ISSUE VOTED ON:

Party Cohesion	**Measure of Party Support on Issue as Voted on**	
	For (42)	*Against* (40)
Democrats— 97%	Democrats— 1 or 2%	Democrats— 36 or 90%
Republicans— 91%	Republicans— 41 or 98%	Republicans— 4 or 10%

Prepared and Compiled by Senate Democratic Policy Committee
Robert C. Byrd. Chairman

SENATE VOTING RECORD

NO. 354

98th Congress
1st Session

November 10, 1983, 11:42 p.m.
Temp. Cong. Rec. p. S-15900

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, 1984

BILL NO.: H.J. Res. 413 **AMENDMENT NO.:** 2581

SUBJECT: **Baker motion to table the Mathias, et al, amendment reducing the grant military assistance program (MAP) from $697 million to $421 million.**

NOTE Proponents of the amendment argued that an 81 percent increase above current funding for a program that has grown 100 percent over the last 3 years cannot be justified during a period of domestic austerity. The amendment provides a 10 percent increase which is more than was approved for the defense budget, and is more than adequate to carry out the program's objective of upgrading existing foreign armies. The figure in the bill is significantly more than that reported by the Foreign Relations and House Appropriations Committees ($387 million and $421 million respectively). MAP funds have been spent frivolously or inappropriately regarding the program's purpose or the needs of the recipient. Between 1970 and 1980, arms imports in developing countries grew from $3.9 million to $19.5 million, but development assistance remained relatively constant in spite of 25 percent population growth. Although loan guarantees are also up—75 percent over 3 years ago—the marked shift toward grants is not in the best interest of the U.S.

Opponents of the amendment noted that the Administration's request had been reduced in Committee by $50 million. An additional one-third cut would seriously damage a longstanding, valuable military assistance program for allies trying to defend themselves without U.S. forces. Many lack the economic means to do so but have either granted the U.S. military base rights or possess strategic materials. The issue is whether the U.S. should act directly in the growing number of trouble spots around the world or assist nations in those regions. The emphasis on grants has become necessary because many recipients cannot repay their outstanding debts or borrow enough to insure their own security. If they are unable to resist armed force or internal subversion, economic aid will be useless. Since the Senate, by a previous vote, earmarked $230 million for Turkey, adoption of this amendment would leave only $189 million for all other strategic nations. Many grants would have to be reduced, confirming suspicions that the U.S. is not a reliable ally. Significant savings could be made, instead, in aid to NATO countries and Japan who can afford their own defense, and whose commercial economies have been subsidized and strengthened by U.S. defense expenditures.

H.J. Res. 413: Vote Nos. 347-354, 356-358.

RESULT: MOTION TO TABLE AGREED TO

YEAS (46)

Democrats (8 or 22%)

Chiles
DeConcini
Huddleston
Johnston
Long
Matsunaga
Nunn
Stennis

Republicans (38 or 83%)

Abdnor
Armstrong
Baker
Boschwitz
Chafee
Cochran
Cohen
D'Amato
Danforth
Denton
Dole
East
Garn
Gorton
Hatch
Hawkins
Hecht
Heinz
Helms
Jepsen
Kassebaum
Kasten
Lugar
Mattingly
Nickles
Packwood
Percy
Quayle
Roth
Rudman
Specter
Stevens
Symms
Thurmond
Trible
Wallop
Warner
Wilson

NAYS (37)

Democrats (29 or 78%)

Baucus
Bentsen
Biden
Bingaman
Boren
Bradley
Bumpers
Burdick
Byrd
Dixon
Eagleton
Exon
Ford
Heflin
Kennedy
Lautenberg
Leahy
Levin
Melcher
Metzenbaum
Mitchell
Pell
Proxmire
Randolph
Riegle
Sarbanes
Sasser
Tsongas
Zorinsky

Republicans (8 or 17%)

Andrews
Grassley
Hatfield
Humphrey
Mathias
Pressler
Stafford
Weicker

NOT VOTING (17)

Democrats (8)

Cranston—^{2}
Dodd—^{2}
Glenn—^{2}
Hart—^{2}
Hollings—^{2}
Inouye—^{2}
Moynihan—^{2}
Pryor—^{2}

Republicans (9)

Domenici—^{2}
Durenberger—^{2}
Evans—^{2}
Goldwater—^{2}
Laxalt—^{2}
McClure—^{2}
Murkowski—^{2}
Simpson—^{2}
Tower—^{2}

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

1—Official Business
2—Necessarily Absent
3—Illness
4—Other

ANALYSIS OF ISSUE VOTED ON:

Party Cohesion

Democrats— 78%
Republicans— 83%

Measure of Party Support on Issue as Voted on

For (46)
Democrats— 8 or 17%
Republicans— 38 or 83%

Against (37)
Democrats— 29 or 78%
Republicans— 8 or 22%

Prepared and Compiled by Senate Democratic Policy Committee
Robert C. Byrd, Chairman

SENATE VOTING RECORD

NO. 357

98th Congress
1st Session

November 11, 1983, 2:12 a.m.
Session of November 10, 1983
Temp. Cong. Rec. p. S-15919

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, 1984

BILL NO.: H.J. Res. 413

AMENDMENT NO.: 2569

SUBJECT: **Stevens appeal of the ruling of the Chair that the Metzenbaum-Hatfield amendment, as modified by the Stevens amendment—Vote No. 356 (permitting termination of certain Federal timber contracts subject to a financial needs test, and providing for extension of contracts subject to payment of moderate interest rates) is out of order as legislation on an appropriations bill. The question is: "Shall the ruling of the Chair stand?"**

NOTE: Proponents of the Chair's ruling (voting yea) argued that the amendment goes beyond the Administration's blanket 5-year extension of certain Federal timber contracts, by setting forth eligibility requirements for relief. Such a plan is clearly legislation on an appropriation. The proposal would benefit irresponsible companies more than those who were frugal, and would create a competitive advantage for operators in the Northwest.
No statements were made in support of the appeal.

H.J. Res. 413: Vote Nos. 347-354, 356-358.

RESULT: DECISION OF CHAIR SUSTAINED

YEAS (43)

Democrats (11 or 31%)

Baucus
Bingaman
Boren
Bumpers
Byrd
DeConcini
Heflin
Huddleston
Johnston
Melcher
Nunn

Republicans (32 or 73%)

Armstrong
Baker
Chafee
Cochran
Danforth
Denton
East
Garn
Grassley
Hatch
Hawkins
Hecht
Heinz
Helms
Humphrey
Jepsen
Kasten
Lugar
Mattingly
Nickles
Percy
Quayle
Roth
Rudman
Stafford
Symms
Thurmond
Trible
Wallop
Warner
Weicker
Wilson

NAYS (37)

Democrats (25 or 69%)

Bentsen
Biden
Bradley
Burdick
Chiles
Dixon
Eagleton
Exon
Ford
Kennedy
Lautenberg
Leahy
Levin
Matsunaga
Metzenbaum
Mitchell
Moynihan
Pell
Proxmire
Randolph
Riegle
Sarbanes
Sasser
Tsongas
Zorinsky

Republicans (12 or 27%)

Abdnor
Andrews
Boschwitz
Cohen
D'Amato
Gorton
Hatfield
Mathias
Packwood
Pressler
Specter
Stevens

NOT VOTING (20)

Democrats (9)

Cranston—2
Dodd—2
Glenn—2
Hart—2
Hollings—2
Inouye—2
Long—2
Pryor—2
Stennis—2

Republicans (11)

Dole—2
Domenici—2
Durenberger—2
Evans—2
Goldwater—2
Kassebaum—2
Laxalt—2
McClure—2
Murkowski—2
Simpson—2
Tower—2

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

1—Official Business
2—Necessarily Absent
3—Illness
4—Other

SYMBOLS:

AY—Announced Yea
AN—Announced Nay
PY—Paired Yea
PN—Paired Nay

ANALYSIS OF ISSUE VOTED ON:

Party Cohesion	Measure of Party Support on Issue as Voted on	
	For (43)	*Against* (37)
Democrats—69%	Democrats—11 or 26%	Democrats—25 or 68%
Republicans—73%	Republicans—32 or 74%	Republicans—12 or 32%

Prepared and Compiled by Senate Democratic Policy Committee
Robert C. Byrd, Chairman

SENATE VOTING RECORD

NO. 367

98th Congress
1st Session

November 16, 1983, 7:59 p.m.
Temp. Cong. Rec. p. S-16334

PUBLIC DEBT LIMIT—OLYMPIC DUTY SUSPENSION

BILL NO.: H.J. Res. 290

AMENDMENT NO.: 2625

SUBJECT: **Hatfield motion to table the Armstrong-Long amendment which increases the debt limit incrementally for one year up to $1.6146 trillion through September 1984 and thereafter; provides that the $225.6 billion increase be added on a quarterly basis; and gives the President impoundment rights on the funds if he is unable to keep governmental spending within the approximate $55 billion quarterly increase in the debt ceiling, with the following limitations: no project may have its outlays reduced more than 20 percent, outlays for a project may not be reduced at all if the reduction would prevent completion of the project, and no benefits paid to individuals (such as social security) could be reduced below existing levels.**

NOTE: Proponents of the amendment contended that the record-breaking high budget deficits show the need for restraint in spending. While this amendment is not a cure all, it offers an element of institutional reform to moderate deficits or at least effectuate an adherence to Congressionally set targets. The President should have discretion over the management of the Federal government, as any corporate head has. The Budget Impoundment and Control Act of 1974 made the mistake of changing the previous practice by requiring that funds appropriated be spent unless the President obtains rescission authority from Congress within 45 days of a request. Under this amendment, which incorporates the actual debt limit figure in the budget resolution projected forward on a month-by-month basis, if the President discovers that the government is off target within the course of a fiscal year, he must defer or rescind spending to stay within the debt limit for that quarter. Alternatively, Congress could act to get the government back on target or act to raise the debt ceiling. The President's discretion would be limited since he could exercise it only to meet limits set by Congress; he could not eliminate any program or project, or reduce it by more than 20 percent, nor could he reduce the current level of benefits paid to individuals under entitlement programs. The amendment, proponents asserted, simply gives the President authority to make economies, if necessary, to stay within the budget.

(OVER)

H.J. Res. 290: Vote Nos. 365, 367.

RESULT: **MOTION TO TABLE AGREED TO**

YEAS (49)

Democrats (33 or 79%)

Baucus
Bentsen
Biden
Bingaman
Bradley
Bumpers
Burdick
Byrd
Chiles
DeConcini
Dixon
Dodd
Eagleton
Ford
Hart
Hollings
Huddleston
Inouye
Lautenberg
Leahy
Levin
Matsunaga
Melcher
Metzenbaum
Mitchell
Moynihan
Pell
Randolph
Riegle
Sarbanes
Sasser
Stennis
Tsongas

Republicans (16 or 30%)

Andrews
Chafee
Cochran
Cohen
D'Amato
Domenici
Gorton
Hatfield
Hawkins
Heinz
Mathias
Rudman
Specter
Stafford
Stevens
Tower

NAYS (46)

Democrats (9 or 21%)

Boren
Exon
Heflin
Johnston
Long
Nunn
Proxmire
Pryor
Zorinsky

Republicans (37 or 70%)

Abdnor
Armstrong
Baker
Boschwitz
Danforth
Denton
Dole
Durenberger
East
Evans
Garn
Goldwater
Grassley
Hatch
Hecht
Helms
Humphrey
Jepsen
Kassebaum
Kasten
Laxalt
Lugar
Mattingly
McClure
Murkowski
Nickles
Packwood
Pressler
Quayle
Roth
Simpson
Symms
Thurmond
Trible
Wallop
Warner
Wilson

NOT VOTING (5)

Democrats (3)

Cranston—2
Glenn—2
Kennedy—2

Republicans (2)

Percy—2
Weicker—2

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

1—Official Business
2—Necessarily Absent
3—Illness
4—Other

SYMBOLS:

AY—Announced Yea
AN—Announced Nay
PY—Paired Yea
PN—Paired Nay

ANALYSIS OF ISSUE VOTED ON:

Party Cohesion

Democrats— 79%
Republicans— 70%

Measure of Party Support on Issue as Voted on

For (49)
Democrats— 33 or 67%
Republicans— 16 or 33%

Against (46)
Democrats— 9 or 20%
Republicans— 37 or 80%

Prepared and Compiled by Senate Democratic Policy Committee
Robert C. Byrd, Chairman

Opponents of the amendment contended that it was unworkable because Federal budget outlays represent estimates and the projections are usually off; it would require the President to cut back spending to the extent that Congress was in error in economic assumptions. The government does not have the monthly expenditure or quarterly accumulation records necessitated by this amendment to base estimates on, nor does it have a consistent revenue flow throughout all fiscal quarters. Adjustment of spending on a quarterly basis, therefore, would not work. In addition, opponents asserted, it is poor policy for Congress to abdicate its responsibilities under the Constitutional assignment of the spending power. Congress holds hearings, listens to witnesses, analyzes the programs, and is elected directly by the people. It is Congress' responsibility to cut the deficit. To give unidentifiable individuals in OMB the authority to reduce programs would decrease responsiveness to the electorate. Some noted that the amendment would give such authority to an Administration which pushed through a major tax cut—which has eroded revenues—while advocating a massive buildup in military spending. Nondefense discretionary spending is, contrary to the myth of budget busting, a small piece of the Federal budget compared to defense and entitlements expenditures.

For other votes on the Public Debt Limit, see Vote Nos. 319-330, 369, and 370.

SENATE VOTING RECORD

NO. 375

98th Congress
1st Session

November 17, 1983, 7:09 p.m.
Temp. Cong. Rec. p. S-16562

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1984

BILL NO.: H.R. 3959 AMENDMENT NO.: 2639

TITLE: "Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1984."

SUBJECT: **Garn motion to table the Levin-Cohen-Byrd, el al, amendment amending current procedures for reviewing eligibility of persons in the social security disability insurance (SSDI) program by requiring more complete notice to beneficiaries; establishing a standard for consideration of pain and requiring consideration of multiple impairments; establishing nationwide standards for termination decisions; continuing authority for payment of benefits during appeal proceedings through December 31, 1985; placing a moratorium on reviews of the mentally impaired until the Social Security Administration improves its guidelines; and requiring that standards for eligibility be subject to public notice and comment and be binding on all administrative levels (estimated cost of amendment is $1 billion over five years).** (The Senate subsequently approved a 6-month extension of benefits during appeal—Vote No. 381.)

NOTE: Proponents of the amendment noted that in 1980 GAO estimated that 20 percent of the individuals receiving disability insurance benefits are ineligible under law. Congress responded with legislation requiring the Social Security Administration (SSA), beginning in 1981, to review the status of each recipient at least once every 3 years unless the disability was classified as permanent. Savings of $150 million were projected. When the Reagan Administration took office, it evidently saw an opportunity to achieve dramatic savings. Reviews were instituted immediately, but the Administration failed to plan review criteria carefully or train the caseworkers making the reviews. As a result, between March 1981 and June 1983, 1,134,000 disabled persons' cases were reviewed and 421,000 of those reviewed, or about 40 percent, were terminated. Many of these recipients had proved incapable of supporting themselves or their families, but were cut from the rolls without any kind of interim or permanent assistance. For them, the needless agony and uncertainty of termination was devastating. Many appealed their termination, however, and Administrative Law Judges overturned about 60 percent of SSA's decisions. It became clear to Congress that the situation was unacceptable, and that the SSDI

(OVER)

H.R. 3959: Vote Nos. 316-318, 371-378.

RESULT: **MOTION TO TABLE AGREED TO**

YEAS (49)

Democrats
(8 or 20%)

Exon
Huddleston
Johnston
Long
Nunn
Proxmire
Stennis
Zorinsky

Republicans
(41 or 75%)

Abdnor
Armstrong
Baker
Chafee
Cochran
D'Amato
Danforth
Denton
Dole
East
Evans
Garn
Goldwater
Gorton
Grassley
Hatch
Hatfield
Hawkins
Hecht
Helms
Laxalt
Lugar
Mathias
Mattingly
McClure
Murkowski
Nickles
Packwood
Percy
Quayle
Roth
Simpson
Stafford
Stevens
Symms
Thurmond
Tower
Trible
Wallop
Weicker
Wilson

NAYS (46)

Democrats
(32 or 80%)

Baucus
Biden
Bingaman
Boren
Bradley
Bumpers
Burdick
Byrd
Chiles
DeConcini
Dixon
Dodd
Eagleton
Ford
Hart
Heflin
Inouye
Lautenberg
Leahy
Levin
Matsunaga
Melcher
Metzenbaum
Mitchell
Moynihan
Pell
Pryor
Randolph
Riegle
Sarbanes
Sasser
Tsongas

Republicans
(14 or 25%)

Andrews
Boschwitz
Cohen
Domenici
Durenberger
Heinz
Humphrey
Jepsen
Kassebaum
Kasten
Pressler
Rudman
Specter
Warner

NOT VOTING (5)

Democrats (5)

Bentsen—2
Cranston—2
Glenn—2
Hollings—2
Kennedy—2AN

Republicans (0)

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

1—Official Business
2—Necessarily Absent
3—Illness
4—Other

SYMBOLS:

AY—Announced Yea
AN—Announced Nay
PY—Paired Yea
PN—Paired Nay

ANALYSIS OF ISSUE VOTED ON:

Party Cohesion	**Measure of Party Support on Issue as Voted on**	
	For (49)	*Against* (46)
Democrats— 80%	Democrats— 8 or 16%	Democrats— 32 or 70%
Republicans— 75%	Republicans— 41 or 84%	Republicans— 14 or 30%

Prepared and Compiled by Senate Democratic Policy Committee
Robert C. Byrd, Chairman

program desperately required a number of reforms to regularize termination proceedings, provide objective eligibility review criteria, and provide adequate protections for the disabled persons the program was intended to serve. In December 1982, benefits were extended to cover the appeal period which can last from 6 to 12 months. This minimal protection is due to expire December 7, 1983. Thirty States have asserted that the process is so unjust that they are using standards other than SSA's; other States are halting reviews altogether. Without this amendment, thousands of SSDI recipients will be left at the mercy of a review process gone awry. It would be irresponsible for Congress to leave the program in its current state of chaos until 1984.

Opponents of the amendment voiced support for some of its objectives, such as continuing benefits during appeal, but contended that it had not been carefully examined enough and could have the effect of further expanding its runaway cost which is already four times higher than anticipated at its inception. SSDI has become an $18 billion a year program involving 2.5 million disabled workers with 4 million beneficiaries in all. The major flaw in this program is that the Federal government pays 100 percent of administrative costs and benefits, but hires State disability examiners who have no incentive to be frugal. It was a mistake to initiate this major spending program with a floor amendment, they reflected, and the mistake would be compounded by adopting these changes in the same manner.

SENATE VOTING RECORD

NO. 376

98th Congress
1st Session

November 17, 1983, 8:09 p.m.
Temp. Cong. Rec. p. S-16571

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1984

BILL NO.: H.R. 3959 **AMENDMENT NO.:** 2641

TITLE: "Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1984."

SUBJECT: **Hatfield motion to table the Johnston, et al. amendment (to the House amendment to Senate amendment No. 36) expressing the sense of the Senate that previous policies of the Department of the Interior under Secretary James Watt altered well-established programs resulting in controversy and litigation, and advising the new Secretary to take immediate action to regain general public confidence in the Department and to insure that Department policies conform with the expressed will of Congress including: ending efforts to lease, for energy development, lands under study for possible designation as wilderness; prohibiting intensified commercial development within wildlife refuges; rejecting plans for the sale and disposal of millions of acres of public lands; resuming both needed purchases of lands for National Parks, National Wildlife Refuges, and National Forests and funding for State and local acquisition of parks and recreational lands; and establishing policies for leasing public mineral resources under conditions of careful environmental protection.** (See also Vote No. 379 on the confirmation of William P. Clark.)

NOTE: Proponents declared that adoption of this amendment would allow the Senate to communicate constructively their concern over many policies and programs instituted by former Secretary Watt and make recommendations to nominee William P. Clark concerning the future direction of the Department. It neither questions Clark's qualifications for the position nor personally attacks former Secretary Watt or anyone who worked under his administration. Clark agreed during his confirmation hearings to review many of the Department's controversial programs but gave little specific information concerning

(OVER)

H.R. 3959: Vote Nos. 316-318, 371-378.

RESULT: MOTION TO TABLE AGREED TO

YEAS (48)

Democrats (0 or 0%)

Republicans (48 or 94%)

Abdnor
Andrews
Armstrong
Baker
Chafee
Cochran
D'Amato
Danforth
Denton
Dole
Domenici
Durenberger
Evans
Garn
Gorton
Grassley
Hatch
Hatfield
Hawkins
Hecht
Heinz
Helms
Jepsen
Kassebaum

Kasten
Laxalt
Lugar
Mathias
Mattingly
McClure
Murkowski
Nickles
Percy
Pressler
Quayle
Roth
Rudman
Simpson
Specter
Stafford
Stevens
Symms
Thurmond
Tower
Trible
Wallop
Weicker
Wilson

NAYS (42)

Democrats (39 or 100%)

Baucus
Biden
Bingaman
Boren
Bradley
Bumpers
Burdick
Byrd
Chiles
DeConcini
Dixon
Dodd
Eagleton
Exon
Ford
Hart
Heflin
Huddleston
Inouye
Johnston

Lautenberg
Leahy
Levin
Matsunaga
Melcher
Metzenbaum
Mitchell
Moynihan
Nunn
Pell
Proxmire
Pryor
Randolph
Riegle
Sarbanes
Sasser
Stennis
Tsongas
Zorinsky

Republicans (3 or 6%)

Boschwitz
Humphrey
Packwood

NOT VOTING (9)

Democrats (5)

Bentsen—^{2}
Cranston—^{2}
Glenn—^{2}
Hollings—^{2}
Kennedy—^{2}

Republicans (4)

Cohen—^{2}
East—^{2PY}
Goldwater—^{2}
Warner—^{2}

LIVE PAIRS (1)

PRESENT AND GIVING:	**RECEIVING:**
Long (PN)	East (PY)

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

1—Official Business
2—Necessarily Absent
3—Illness
4—Other

SYMBOLS:

AY—Announced Yea
AN—Announced Nay
PY—Paired Yea
PN—Paired Nay

ANALYSIS OF ISSUE VOTED ON:

Party Cohesion	**Measure of Party Support on Issue as Voted on** *For* (48)	*Against* (42)
Democrats— 100%	Democrats— 0 or 0%	Democrats— 39 or 93%
Republicans— 94%	Republicans— 48 or 100%	Republicans— 3 or 7%

Prepared and Compiled by Senate Democratic Policy Committee
Robert C. Byrd, Chairman

his own views on many of the nation's most significant environmental and natural resource policies. He also refused to state that he intends to redirect the Department's policies which threaten the delicate balance between resource use and conservation. It is imperative that the new Secretary regain public support and confidence; this amendment would inform Mr. Clark that, if confirmed, the Senate would expect him to restore a proper balance to the Department's programs and act quickly to correct the policies of former Secretary Watt which endanger our nation's natural resources and public lands.

Opponents contended that the amendment was an attempt to "embarrass the Administration" and would infer incorrectly that the Interior Department policies under President Reagan had been detrimental to the environment and not in the best interest of the nation. On the contrary, former Secretary James Watt strived to do his very best to carry out the duties he was given by our President. His only "fault" was believing in capitalism and private property, they maintained, and encouraging the multiple use of public lands to provide America with energy in order to maintain our industrial base as well as for recreational purposes. This language would be "one last kick" at a great American, who did a great job for this country. Senators may vote against the appointment of William P. Clark if they do not think the President made a wise choice, but to attempt to pass anything that might limit the ability of the nominee to perform his new job as Secretary of Interior would be totally out of order. Others opposed the amendment because they felt it would imperil enactment of the supplemental appropriations bill.

SENATE VOTING RECORD

NO. 377

98th Congress
1st Session

November 17, 1983, 8:42 p.m.
Temp. Cong. Rec. p. S-16573

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1984

BILL NO.: H.R. 3959

AMENDMENT NO.: 2643

TITLE: "Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1984."

SUBJECT: **Garn motion to table the Metzenbaum amendment prohibiting the spending of any funds through September 30, 1984, by the Securities and Exchange Commission to implement changes in its regulations eliminating the requirement that corporations disclose executive perquisites (including travel, club membership, etc) to stockholders.**

NOTE: Proponents of the amendment asserted that the sweeping SEC rules changes would deny important information to stockholders and investors; and their implementation, therefore, should be delayed until Congress can examine the issue thoroughly. The SEC received comments on the proposed regulation changes, but the report was very imbalanced with only 15 of 115 responses from individual shareholders. Eleven of those 15 respondents were critical of the Commission's proposal which would deny valuable investment information to stockholders on which to base investment decisions. Companies would no longer be required to report detailed information on salaries and fringe benefits paid top-level executives, provided these benefits amount to less than $25,000 or 10 percent of the individual's salary. The cost of these benefits would be calculated based on the cost to the company rather than their actual value. The SEC rule would also repeal detailed reporting requirements concerning incentive pay plans and stock options, and fewer executives would be required to disclose their salaries. Even Theodore A. Levine, Associate Director of the SEC's Enforcement Division, has criticized the proposal, stating that it would "make it more difficult to evaluate public companies without any corresponding benefit to

(OVER)

H.R. 3959: Vote Nos. 316-318, 371-378.

RESULT: MOTION TO TABLE AGREED TO

YEAS (51)

Democrats (3 or 8%)

Dixon
Heflin
Long

Republicans (48 or 94%)

Abdnor
Andrews
Armstrong
Baker
Boschwitz
Chafee
Cochran
D'Amato
Danforth
Denton
Dole
Domenici
East
Evans
Garn
Gorton
Grassley
Hatch
Hatfield
Hawkins
Hecht
Heinz
Jepsen
Kassebaum
Kasten
Laxalt
Lugar
Mathias
Mattingly
McClure
Murkowski
Nickles
Packwood
Percy
Pressler
Quayle
Roth
Rudman
Simpson
Stafford
Stevens
Symms
Thurmond
Tower
Trible
Warner
Weicker
Wilson

NAYS (40)

Democrats (37 or 92%)

Baucus
Biden
Bingaman
Boren
Bradley
Bumpers
Burdick
Byrd
Chiles
DeConcini
Dodd
Eagleton
Exon
Ford
Hart
Huddleston
Inouye
Johnston
Lautenberg
Leahy
Levin
Matsunaga
Melcher
Metzenbaum
Mitchell
Moynihan
Nunn
Pell
Proxmire
Pryor
Randolph
Riegle
Sarbanes
Sasser
Stennis
Tsongas
Zorinsky

Republicans (3 or 6%)

Helms
Humphrey
Specter

NOT VOTING (9)

Democrats (5)

Bentsen—2
Cranston—2
Glenn—2
Hollings—2
Kennedy—2

Republicans (4)

Cohen—2
Durenberger—2
Goldwater—2
Wallop—2

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

1—Official Business
2—Necessarily Absent
3—Illness
4—Other

SYMBOLS:

AY—Announced Yea
AN—Announced Nay
PY—Paired Yea
PN—Paired Nay

ANALYSIS OF ISSUE VOTED ON:

Party Cohesion

Democrats— 93%
Republicans— 94%

Measure of Party Support on Issue as Voted on

For (51)
Democrats— 3 or 6%
Republicans— 48 or 94%

Against (40)
Democrats— 37 or 93%
Republicans— 3 or 7%

Prepared and Compiled by Senate Democratic Policy Committee
Robert C. Byrd, Chairman

registrants." The potential savings to the registrants would not be sufficient to justify the changes, he added, and certain amendments reduce disclosure requirements without significantly simplifying the procedure, reducing compliance burdens, or providing added flexibility. The SEC is bound to consider the public benefit as well as the private cost of any regulation, and the benefit to the public and stockholders, who deserve to know how corporate funds are being expended, far outweighs the costs associated with reporting executive compensation.

Opponents of the amendment stated that they had substantive objections to it, but would not debate the issue on its merits. The main argument for tabling the amendment was that its adoption might jeopardize the Housing-IMF package which had been added to the conference report (Vote No. 374).